arXiv:1302.0041v1 [math.AC] 1 Feb 2013

CONSTRUCTION OF FREE COMMUTATIVE INTEGRO-DIFFERENTIAL ALGEBRAS BY THE METHOD OF GRÖBNER-SHIRSHOV BASES

XING GAO, LI GUO, AND SHANGHUA ZHENG

Abstract. In this paper, we construct a canonical linear basis for free commutative integro-differential algebras by applying the method of Gröbner-Shirshov bases. We establish the Composition-Diamond Lemma for free commutative differential Rota-Baxter algebras of order n. We also obtain a weakly monomial order on these algebras, allowing us to obtain Gröbner-Shirshov bases for free commutative integro-differential algebras on a set. We finally generalize the concept of functional derivations to free differential algebras with arbitrary weight and generating sets from which to construct a canonical linear basis for free commutative integro-differential algebras.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
1.1. Integro-differential algebras 1
1.2. Gröbner-Shirshov bases 3
1.3. Outline of the paper 4
2. Free commutative integro-differential algebras 4
2.1. The definitions 4
2.2. Free differential Rota-Baxter algebras 5
2.3. Free commutative operated algebras 6
3. Weakly monomial order 9
4. Composition-Diamond lemma 14
5. Groöbner-Shirshov bases and free commutative integro-differential algebras 19
5.1. Gröbner-Shirshov basis 20
5.2. Bases for free commutative integro-differential algebras 23
References 27

1. Introduction

1.1. Integro-differential algebras.

The algebraic study in analysis has a long history. The first monograph [30] of Ritt on algebraic study of differential equations appeared almost one hundred years ago. The concept of a **differential algebra** was abstracted from the Leibniz formula

$$d(uv) = d(u)v + ud(v) \tag{1}$$

in calculus. After the fundamental works of Ritt [31] and Kolchin [28], the theory of differential algebra has been expanded to a vast area of pure and applied mathematical study [13, 37]. The

---

Date: February 4, 2013.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16S15, 13P10, 16W99, 17A50, 12H05, 47G20 .

Key words and phrases. Differential algebra, Rota-Baxter algebra, integro-differential algebra, Gröbner-Shirshov basis, free algebra, shuffle product, mixable shuffle product.

algebraic study of the integral analysis began with the concept of a Baxter algebra [3], later called a **Rota-Baxter algebra**. Here the basis of abstraction is the integration by parts formula,

$$P(u)P(v) = P(uP(v)) + P(P(u)v) + \lambda P(uv), \tag{2}$$

rewritten in a form that only involves the integral operator P, defined by $P(u)(x) := \int_a^x u(t)\,dt$. The extra term parameterized by a constant λ allows both the integral operator (when $\lambda = 0$) and the summation operator (when $\lambda = 1$), as well as quite a few other operators, to be encoded into one equation. Since then, Rota-Baxter algebra has found broad applications from combinatorics and number theory to classical Yang-Baxter equation and quantum field theory [2, 16, 18, 19, 25, 33, 34, 35].

Motivated by the close relationship between the differential and integral analysis as shown in the First Fundamental Theorem of Calculus, coordinated studied of differential algebra and Rota-Baxter algebra have emerged recently, beginning with the two simultaneously introduced concepts of a differential Rota-Baxter algebra and an integro-differential algebra.

The concept of a differential Rota-Baxter algebra [22] is a simple coupling of a **differential operator** d **of weight** λ:

$$d(uv) = d(u)v + ud(v) + \lambda d(u)d(v),\ d(1) = 0, \tag{3}$$

with a Rota-Baxter operator P of the same weight by the abstraction of the First Fundamental Theorem of Calculus

$$d \circ P = \mathrm{id}, \tag{4}$$

where id is the identity map. On the other hand, the concept of an **integro-differential algebra**, first considered in the weight 0 case in [32] and in the general weight case in [23], also takes into account the intertwining relationship of the two operators in the original definition of the integration by parts formula

$$P(d(u)P(v)) = uP(v) - P(uv) - \lambda P(d(u)v). \tag{5}$$

We note that Eq. (5) implies Eq. (2) at the presence of Eq. (4) when u is substituted by $P(u)$. Thus the variety of integro-differential algebras is the variety of differential Rota-Baxter algebras modulo extra conditions. See [23] for further details.

As in the case of studying any algebraic structures, the free objects play an important role in the study of previous algebras. While the construction of free differential algebras is straightforward in terms of differential monomials, the construction of free Rota-Baxter algebras is more involved. In fact, there are three constructions in the commutative case, with the first one given by Rota [33] through an internal construction, and an external one given by Cartier [12]. In [20], a construction is given by a generalization of the shuffle product, called the mixable shuffle product which is closely related to the quasi-shuffle product [27] in the study of multiple zeta values.

By composing the construction of free differential algebras followed by that of the free Rota-Baxter algebras, free differential Rota-Baxter algebras were obtained in [22]. Because of the more intimate relationship of the differential and Rota-Baxter operators in an integro-differential algebra, it is more challenging to construct free objects in the corresponding category even by the previous remark on the variety of integro-differential algebras, free integro-differential algebras are quotients of free differential Rota-Baxter algebras modulo the relation given by Eq. (5). The first construction of free commutative integro-differential algebras was obtained in the recent paper [23]. There the construction makes essential use of an equivalent formulation of the condition in Eq. (5) for the integro-differential algebra.

1.2. **Gröbner-Shirshov bases.** In this paper, we apply the method of Gröbner-Shirshov bases to give another construction of the free commutative integro-differential algebras on a set.

The method of Gröbner bases or Gröbner-Shirshov bases originated from the work of Buchburger [11] (for commutative polynomial algebras), Hironaka [26] (for infinite series algebras) and Shirshov [36] (for Lie algebras). It has since become a fundamental method in commutative algebra, algebraic geometry and computational algebra, and has been extended to many other algebraic structures, notably associative algebras [4, 5]. In recent years, the method of Gröbner-Shirshov bases has been applied to a large number of algebraic structures to study problems on normal forms, word problems, rewriting systems, embedding theorems, extensions, growth functions and Hilbert series. See [6, 8, 10] for further details.

This method also derives free objects in various categories, including the alternative constructions of free Rota-Baxter algebras and free differential Rota-Baxter algebras [7, 9]. The basic idea is to prove a composition-diamond lemma that achieves a rewriting procedure to reduce any element to certain "standard form". Then the set of elements in standard form is a basis of the free object.

We apply this method to construct a free commutative integro-differential algebra as the quotient of a free commutative differential Rota-Baxter algebra modulo the "hybrid" integral by part formula in Eq. (5). In order to do so, we would expect to first establish a Composition-Diamond Lemma for the free commutative differential Rota-Baxter algebra constructed in [22]. We should then prove that the ideal generated by the defining relation of integro-differential algebras in Eq. (5) has a Gröbner-Shirshov basis, thereby identifying a basis of a free commutative integro-differential algebra as a canonical subset of the known basis of the free commutative differential Rota-Baxter algebra. All these depend on the choice of a suitable monomial order on the set of the basis elements of the free commutative differential Rota-Baxter algebra. However a moment's thought reveals that such a monomial order does not exist for this algebra. To overcome this difficulty, we consider this algebra as a filtered algebra with respect to the order of derivation and study the filtration pieces first. Even there, we have to get along with a weakly monomial order which fortunately suffices for our applications. So we are able to adapt the above process of Gröbner-Shirshov bases and obtain a canonical basis for each of the filtration pieces. We then check that this process is compatible with the filtration structure, allowing us to put these canonical bases for the filtration pieces together to form a canonical basis for the entire free commutative integro-differential algebra. The following is our main theorem

Theorem 1.1. (=*Theorem 5.13*) *Let X be a nonempty well-ordered set and $A := \mathbf{k}\{X\}$. Let $Ш(\mathbf{k}\{X\}) = Ш(\mathbf{k}[\Delta X])$, with the derivation d and Rota-Baxter operator P, be the free commutative differential Rota-Baxter algebra of weight λ on X. Let I_{ID} be the differential Rota-Baxter ideal of $Ш(\mathbf{k}\{X\})$ generated by*

$$S := \{P(d(u)P(v)) - uP(v) + P(uv) + \lambda P(d(u)v) \mid u, v \in Ш(\mathbf{k}\{X\})\}.$$

Let A_f be the submodule of $A = \mathbf{k}\{X\}$ spanned by functional monomials. Then the composition

$$Ш(A)_f := A \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{k\geq 0} A \otimes A_f^{\otimes k} \otimes A \right) \hookrightarrow Ш(A) \to Ш(A)/I_{ID}$$

of the inclusion and the quotient map is a linear bijection. Thus $Ш(A)_f$ gives an explicit construction of the free integro-differential algebra $Ш(A)/I_{ID}$.

It is interesting to note that our approach of Gröbner-Shirshov bases gives a different construction of free commutative integro-differential algebras than those in [23]. While the construction in [23] has a transparent product formula, the construction here has a simple description as a submodule of the free differential Rota-Baxter algebra. By the uniqueness of the free objects, the two constructions yield isomorphic integro-differential algebras. Thus it would be interesting to compare the two constructions to reveal further the structure and properties of these free objects.

1.3. **Outline of the paper.** In Section 2, we first introduce the algebraic structures that lead up to λ-integro-differential algebras and then recall the construction of free objects for these algebraic structures, in particular the free commutative Rota-Baxter algebras and the free commutative differential Rota-Baxter algebras. In Section 3, we first give definitions related to differential Rota-Baxter monomials and then define a weakly monomial order on differential Rota-Baxter monomials of order n. In Section 4, we start with defining various kinds of compositions and then establish the Composition-Diamond Lemma for the n-th order free commutative differential Rota-Baxter algebra. In Section 5, we consider a finite set X and obtain a Gröbner-Shirshov basis for the defining ideal of a free commutative order n integro-differential algebra on X and thus obtain an explicitly defined basis for this free object. Then as mentioned above, we put the order n pieces together as a direct system to obtain a basis for the free commutative integro-differential algebra on X. We then use a finiteness argument to treat the case when X is any well-ordered set.

2. FREE COMMUTATIVE INTEGRO-DIFFERENTIAL ALGEBRAS

We recall the definitions of algebras with various differential and integral operators and the constructions of the free objects in the corresponding categories.

2.1. **The definitions.** We recall the algebraic structures considered in this paper. We also introduce variations with bounded derivation order that will be needed later.

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathbf{k}$ be a unitary commutative ring. Let $\lambda \in \mathbf{k}$ be fixed.

(a) A **differential k-algebra of weight** λ (also called a λ**-differential k-algebra**) is a unitary associative $\mathbf{k}$-algebra R together with a linear operator $d\colon R \to R$ such that

$$d(1) = 0,\ d(uv) = d(u)v + ud(v) + \lambda d(u)d(v) \text{ for all } u, v \in R. \tag{6}$$

Such an algebra (R, d) is said **of order** n, where $n \geq 1$, if $d^n = 0$.

(b) A **Rota-Baxter k-algebra of weight** λ is an associative $\mathbf{k}$-algebra R together with a linear operator $P\colon R \to R$ such that

$$P(u)P(v) = P(uP(v)) + P(P(u)v) + \lambda P(uv) \text{ for all } u, v \in R. \tag{7}$$

(c) A **differential Rota-Baxter k-algebra of weight** λ (also called a λ**-differential Rota-Baxter k-algebra**) is a differential $\mathbf{k}$-algebra (R, d) of weight λ and a Rota-Baxter operator P of weight λ such that

$$d \circ P = \mathrm{id}. \tag{8}$$

(d) An **integro-differential k-algebra of weight** λ (also called a λ**-integro-differential k-algebra**) is a differential $\mathbf{k}$-algebra (R, d) of weight λ with a linear operator $P\colon R \to R$ that satisfies Eq. (8) and such that

$$P(d(u)P(v)) = uP(v) - P(uv) - \lambda P(d(u)v) \text{ for all } u, v \in R. \tag{9}$$

2.2. **Free differential Rota-Baxter algebras.** We first recall the construction of free commutative differential algebras and introduce their order n variations.

Theorem 2.2. *Let X be a set.*

(a) *Let $\Delta X = \{x^{(n)} \mid x \in X, n \geq 0\}$ and let $\mathbf{k}\{X\} = \mathbf{k}[\Delta X]$ be the free commutative algebra on the set ΔX. Define $d_X : \mathbf{k}[\Delta X] \to \mathbf{k}[\Delta X]$ as follows. Let $w = u_1 \cdots u_k, u_i \in \Delta X$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, be a commutative word from the alphabet set ΔX. If $k = 1$, so that $w = x^{(n)} \in \Delta X$, define $d_X(w) = x^{(n+1)}$. If $k > 1$, recursively define*

$$d_X(w) = d_X(u_1)u_2 \cdots u_k + u_1 d_X(u_2 \cdots u_k) + \lambda d_X(u_1) d_X(u_2 \cdots u_k). \tag{10}$$

Further define $d_X(1) = 0$ and then extend d_X to $\mathbf{k}[\Delta(X)]$ by linearity. Then $(\mathbf{k}[\Delta X], d_X)$ is the free commutative differential algebra of weight λ on the set X.

(b) *For a given $n \geq 1$, let $\Delta X^{(n+1)} := \left\{x^{(k)} \,\middle|\, x \in X, k \geq n+1\right\}$. Then $\mathbf{k}\{X\}\Delta X^{(n+1)}$ is the differential ideal I_n of $\mathbf{k}\{X\}$ generated by the set $\{x^{(n+1)} \mid x \in X\}$. The quotient $\mathbf{k}\{X\}/I_n$ has a canonical basis given by $\Delta_n X := \{x^{(k)} \mid k \leq n\}$.*

Proof. Item (a) is from [22] and Item (b) is a direct consequence. □

For a set Y, let $C(Y)$ denote the free commutative monoid on Y. Thus elements in $C(Y)$ are commutative words, plus the identity 1, from the alphabet set Y. Then $C(\Delta X)$ (resp. $C(\Delta_n X)$) is a linear basis of $\mathbf{k}[\Delta X]$ (resp. $\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X]$).

We next recall the construction of free commutative Rota-Baxter algebras in terms of mixable shuffles [20, 21]. The mixable shuffle product is shown to be the same as the quasi-shuffle product of Hoffman [15, 25, 27]. Let A be a commutative $\mathbf{k}$-algebra. Define

$$Ш(A) = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} A^{\otimes(k+1)} = A \oplus A^{\otimes 2} \oplus \cdots.$$

Let $\mathfrak{a} = a_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_m \in A^{\otimes(m+1)}$ and $\mathfrak{b} = b_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_n \in A^{\otimes(n+1)}$. If $m = 0$ or $n = 0$, define

$$\mathfrak{a} \diamond \mathfrak{b} = \begin{cases} (a_0 b_0) \otimes b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_n, & m = 0, n > 0, \\ (a_0 b_0) \otimes a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_m, & m > 0, n = 0, \\ a_0 b_0, & m = n = 0. \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

If $m > 0$ and $n > 0$, inductively (on $m + n$) define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{a} \diamond \mathfrak{b} \;=\; (a_0 b_0) \otimes \Big(&(a_1 \otimes a_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_m) \diamond (1 \otimes b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_n) \\ &+ (1 \otimes a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_m) \diamond (b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_n) \\ &+ \lambda\, (a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_m) \diamond (b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_n) \Big). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Extending by additivity, we obtain a $\mathbf{k}$-bilinear map

$$\diamond : Ш(A) \times Ш(A) \to Ш(A).$$

Alternatively,

$$\mathfrak{a} \diamond \mathfrak{b} = (a_0 b_0) \otimes (\bar{\mathfrak{a}} ш_\lambda \bar{\mathfrak{b}}),$$

where $\bar{\mathfrak{a}} = a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_m$, $\bar{\mathfrak{b}} = b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_n$ and $ш_\lambda$ is the mixable shuffle (quasi-shuffle) product of weight λ [19, 20, 27], which specializes to the shuffle product $ш$ when $\lambda = 0$.

Define a $\mathbf{k}$-linear endomorphism P_A on $Ш(A)$ by assigning

$$P_A(x_0 \otimes x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_n) = \mathbf{1}_A \otimes x_0 \otimes x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_n,$$

for all $x_0 \otimes x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_n \in A^{\otimes(n+1)}$ and extending by additivity. Let $j_A\colon A \to Ш(A)$ be the canonical inclusion map.

Theorem 2.3. ([20, 21])

(a) *The pair* $(Ш(A), P_A)$, *together with the natural embedding* $j_A\colon A \to Ш(A)$, *is the free commutative Rota-Baxter* **k**-*algebra on* A *of weight* λ. *In other words, for any Rota-Baxter* **k**-*algebra* (R,P) *and any* **k**-*algebra map* $\varphi\colon A \to R$, *there exists a unique Rota-Baxter* **k**-*algebra homomorphism* $\tilde{\varphi}\colon (Ш(A), P_A) \to (R,P)$ *such that* $\varphi = \tilde{\varphi} \circ j_A$ *as* **k**-*algebra homomorphisms.*

(b) *Let* Y *be a set and let* $\mathbf{k}[Y]$ *be the free commutative algebra on* Y. *The pair* $(Ш(Y), P_Y) := (Ш(\mathbf{k}[Y]), P_{\mathbf{k}[Y]})$, *together with the natural embedding* $j_Y\colon Y \to \mathbf{k}[Y] \to Ш(\mathbf{k}[Y])$, *is the free commutative Rota-Baxter* **k**-*algebra of weight* λ *on* Y.

Since $\diamond$ is compatible with the multiplication in A, we will often suppress the symbol $\diamond$ and simply denote xy for $x \diamond y$ in $Ш(A)$, unless there is a danger of confusion.

A linear basis of $Ш(\mathbf{k}[Y])$ is given by

$$\mathfrak{B}(Y) := \left\{ x_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_k \,\middle|\, x_i \in C(Y), 1 \leq i \leq k, k \geq 0 \right\}, \tag{13}$$

called the set of **Rota-Baxter monomials** in Y. The integer $\operatorname{dep}(x_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_k) := k+1$ is called the **depth** of $x_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_k$. To simplify notations, we also let P denote $P_{\mathbf{k}[Y]}$. Then $1 \otimes u$ and $P(u)$ stand for the same element and will be be used as convenience in this paper.

We now put the differential and Rota-Baxter algebra structures together. Let (A, d_0) be a commutative differential **k**-algebra of weight λ. Extend d_0 to $Ш(A)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & d_A(x_0 \otimes x_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes x_k) \\ = \;& d_0(x_0) \otimes x_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes x_k + x_0x_1 \otimes x_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes x_k + \lambda d_0(x_0) x_1 \otimes x_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes x_k, \quad k \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.4. ([22]) *Let* X *be a set and let* $\mathbf{k}[\Delta X]$ *be the free commutative differential algebra of weight* λ *on* X *in Theorem 2.2.(a). The triple* $(Ш(\mathbf{k}[\Delta X]), d_{\mathbf{k}[\Delta X]}, P_{\mathbf{k}[\Delta X]})$, *together with* $j_X : X \to \Delta X \to Ш(\mathbf{k}[\Delta X])$, *is the free commutative differential Rota-Baxter* **k**-*algebra of weight* λ *on* X.

Apply the notations in Eq. (13) to $Y := \Delta X$. The set

$$\mathfrak{B}(\Delta X) := \left\{ u_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_k \,\middle|\, u_i \in C(\Delta X), 0 \leq i \leq k, k \geq 0 \right\} \tag{14}$$

is a **k**-basis of the free commutative differential Rota-Baxter algebra $Ш(\Delta X)$, called the set of **differential Rota-Baxter (DRB) monomials** on X.

Similarly with $Y := \Delta_n X, n \geq 1$, $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ is a basis of $Ш(\Delta_n X)$ and is called the set of **DRB monomials of order** n on X. We note that in $Ш(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X])$, the property $d^{n+1}(u) = 0$ only applies to $u \in X$, but not to tensors of length greater than two. For example, taking $n = 1$, then $d^2(x) = 0$, but $d(1 \otimes x) = x$ and hence $d^2(1 \otimes x) = d(x) = x^{(1)} \neq 0$.

2.3. **Free commutative operated algebras.** We now construct the free commutative operated algebra on a set X that has the free commutative (differential) Rota-Baxter algebra as a quotient. At the same time, the explicit construction $Ш(X)$ of free commutative Rota-Baxter algebra in Theorem 2.3 can be realized on a submodule of the free commutative operated algebra spanned by reduced words under a rewriting rule defined by the Rota-Baxter axiom.

This construction is parallel to that of the free (noncommutative) operated algebra on a set in [9, 17, 19, 24]. See [29] for the non-unitary case.

Definition 2.5. A **commutative operated monoid with operator set** Ω is a commutative monoid G together with maps $\alpha_\omega : G \to G, \omega \in \Omega$. A homomorphism between commutative operated monoids $(G, \{\alpha_\omega\}_\omega)$ and $(H, \{\beta_\omega\}_\omega)$ is a monoid homomorphism $f : G \to H$ such that $f \circ \alpha_\omega = \beta_\omega \circ f$ for $\omega \in \Omega$.

We next construct the free objects in the category of commutative operated monoids.

Fix a set Y. We define monoids $\mathfrak{C}_n := \mathfrak{C}_n(Y)$ for $n \geq 0$ by a recursion. First denote $\mathfrak{C}_0 := C(Y)$. Let $\lfloor C(Y)\rfloor_\omega := \{\lfloor u\rfloor_\omega \,|\, u \in C(Y)\}, \omega \in \Omega$, be disjoint sets in bijection with and disjoint from $C(Y)$. Then define

$$\mathfrak{C}_1 := C(Y \sqcup (\sqcup_{\omega\in\Omega}\lfloor C(Y)\rfloor_\omega)).$$

Note that elements in $\lfloor C(Y)\rfloor_\omega$ are only symbols indexed by elements in $C(Y)$. For example, $\lfloor 1\rfloor_\omega$ is not the identity, but a new symbol. The inclusion $Y \hookrightarrow Y \sqcup (\sqcup_{\omega\in\Omega}\lfloor \mathfrak{C}_0\rfloor_\omega)$ induces a monomorphism $i_{0,1} : \mathfrak{C}_0 = C(Y) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{C}_1 = C(Y \sqcup (\sqcup_\omega \lfloor \mathfrak{C}_0\rfloor_\omega))$ of free commutative monoids through which we identify $\mathfrak{C}_0$ with its image in $\mathfrak{C}_1$. Inductively assume that $\mathfrak{C}_{n-1}$ have been defined for $n \geq 2$ and that the embedding

$$i_{n-2,n-1} : \mathfrak{C}_{n-2} \to \mathfrak{C}_{n-1}$$

has been obtained. We then define

$$\mathfrak{C}_n := C(Y \sqcup (\sqcup_\omega\lfloor \mathfrak{C}_{n-1}\rfloor_\omega)). \tag{15}$$

We also have the injection

$$\lfloor \mathfrak{C}_{n-2}\rfloor_\omega \hookrightarrow \lfloor \mathfrak{C}_{n-1}\rfloor_\omega,\ \omega \in \Omega.$$

Thus by the freeness of $\mathfrak{C}_{n-1} = C(Y \sqcup (\sqcup_\omega\lfloor \mathfrak{C}_{n-2}\rfloor_\omega))$ as a free commutative monoid, we have

$$\mathfrak{C}_{n-1} \quad = \quad C(Y \sqcup (\sqcup_\omega\lfloor \mathfrak{C}_{n-2}\rfloor_\omega)) \hookrightarrow C(Y \sqcup (\sqcup_\omega\lfloor \mathfrak{C}_{n-1}\rfloor_\omega)) = \mathfrak{C}_n.$$

We finally define the commutative monoid

$$\mathfrak{C}(Y) := \bigcup_{n\geq 0} \mathfrak{C}_n = \varinjlim \mathfrak{C}_n.$$

Elements in $\mathfrak{C}(Y)$ are called **bracketed monomials** in Y. Defining

$$\lfloor\ \rfloor_\omega : \mathfrak{C}(Y) \to \mathfrak{C}(Y), u \mapsto \lfloor u\rfloor_\omega,\ \omega \in \Omega, \tag{16}$$

$(\mathfrak{C}(Y), \{\lfloor\ \rfloor_\omega\}_\omega)$ is a commutative operated monoid and its linear span $(\mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(Y), \lfloor\ \rfloor_\omega)$ is a commutative (unitary) operated $\mathbf{k}$-algebra.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $j_Y : Y \to \mathfrak{C}(Y)$ be the natural embedding.*

(a) *The triple $(\mathfrak{C}(Y), \{\lfloor\ \rfloor_\omega\}_\omega, j_Y)$ is the free commutative operated monoid on Y. More precisely, for any commutative operated monoid G and set map $f : Y \to G$, there is a unique extension of f to a homomorphism $\underline{f} : \mathfrak{C}(Y) \to G$ of operated monoids.*

(b) *The triple $(\mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(Y), \{\lfloor\ \rfloor_\omega\}_\omega, j_Y)$ is the free commutative operated unitary $\mathbf{k}$-algebra on Y. More precisely, for any commutative $\mathbf{k}$-algebra R and set map $f : Y \to R$, there is a unique extension of f to a homomorphism $\underline{f} : \mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(Y) \to R$ of operated $\mathbf{k}$-algebras.*

Proof. We only need to show that $\mathfrak{C}(Y)$ is a free commutative operated monoid. The proof is similar to the noncommutative case [17, 19], so we just give a sketch.

Let a commutative operated monoid $(G, \{\alpha_\omega\}_\omega)$ and a map $f : Y \to G$ be given. Then by the universal property of $\mathfrak{C}_0 := C(Y)$, there is a unique monoid homomorphism $f_0 : \mathfrak{C}_0 \to G$ extending f. Then f_0 extends uniquely to

$$f_1 : \lfloor \mathfrak{C}_0\rfloor_\omega \to G, \quad \lfloor u\rfloor_\omega \mapsto \alpha_\omega(f_0(u)), u \in \mathfrak{C}_0,$$

such that $(f_1 \circ \lfloor\ \rfloor_\omega)(u) = (\alpha_\omega \circ f_1)(u), \omega \in \Omega$, when defined. We then further get a monoid homomorphism

$$f_1 : \mathfrak{C}_1 := C(Y \sqcup (\sqcup_\omega \lfloor \mathfrak{C}_0 \rfloor_\omega)) \to G.$$

By induction on $n \geq 0$ we obtain a unique $f_n : \mathfrak{C}_n \to G, n \geq 0$, compatible with the direct system, yielding the unique homomorphism $\bar{f} : \mathfrak{C}(Y) \to G$ of operated monoids. □

By the universal property of $\mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(Y)$, we obtain the following conclusion from general principles of universal algebra [1, 14].

Proposition 2.7. *Let $\Omega = \{d, P\}$ and denote $d(u) := \lfloor u \rfloor_d, P(u) := \lfloor u \rfloor_P$. Let I_{DRB} be the operated ideal of $\mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(Y)$ generated by the set*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(uv) - d(u)v - ud(v) - \lambda d(u)d(v), \\ P(u)P(v) - P(uP(v)) - P(P(u)v) - \lambda P(uv), \\ (d \circ P)(u) = u \end{array} \middle| \; u, v \in \mathfrak{C}(Y) \right\}.$$

Then the quotient operated algebra $\mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(Y)/I_{DRB}$, with the quotient of the operator d and P, is the free commutative differential Rota-Baxter algebra.

Combining Proposition 2.7 with Theorem 2.3, we have

Proposition 2.8. *The natural embedding*

$$Ш(\mathbf{k}[\Delta X]) \to \mathbf{k}\,\mathfrak{C}(\Delta X), \quad x_0 \otimes x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_k \mapsto x_0 P(x_1 P(\cdots P(x_k) \cdots))$$

composed with the quotient map $\rho : \mathbf{k}\,\mathfrak{C}(\Delta X) \to \mathbf{k}\,\mathfrak{C}(\Delta X)/I_{DRB}$ gives a linear bijection (in fact, an isomorphism of differential Rota-Baxter algebras)

$$\theta : Ш(\mathbf{k}[\Delta X]) \to \mathbf{k}\,\mathfrak{C}(\Delta X)/I_{DRB}.$$

Through θ, we can identify the basis $\mathfrak{B}(\Delta X)$ of $Ш(\mathbf{k}\Delta X)$ with its image in $\mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(\Delta X)$:

$$u_0 \otimes u_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_k \leftrightarrow u_0 \lfloor u_1 \lfloor \cdots \lfloor u_k \rfloor \cdots \rfloor\rfloor \leftrightarrow u_0 P(u_1 P(\cdots P(u_k) \cdots)). \tag{17}$$

Thus we also use P for $P_{\Delta X}$ on $Ш(\mathbf{k}[\Delta X])$ and $d^\ell(x) = x^{(\ell)}$ for $x \in X$ and $\ell \geq 0$.

As a consequence of Proposition 2.8, we have

Corollary 2.9. *Let $n \geq 1$. Let $I_{DRB,n}$ be the operated ideal of $\mathfrak{C}(X)$ generated by I_{DRB} together with the set $\{x^{(n+1)} = d^{n+1}(x) \,|\, x \in X\}$. The natural embedding*

$$Ш(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X]) \to \mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(X), \quad x_0 \otimes x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_k \mapsto x_0 P(x_1 P(\cdots P(x_k) \cdots))$$

composed with the quotient map $\rho : \mathbf{k}\,\mathfrak{C}(Y) \to \mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(Y)/I_{DRB,n}$ gives a linear bijection

$$\theta_n : Ш(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X]) \to \mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(X)/I_{DRB,n}.$$

Proof. The map θ_n is obtained by starting from the isomorphism $\theta : Ш(\mathbf{k}[\Delta X]) \cong \mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(X)/I_{DRB}$ and then taking the quotients of both the domain and range by the operated ideal generated by $d^{n+1}(x), x \in X$. Since θ restricted to the identity on X. The corollary follows. □

Define the **reduction map**

$$\mathrm{Red} := \mathrm{Red}_n := \theta_n^{-1} \circ \rho : \mathbf{k}\,\mathfrak{C}(X) \to \mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(Y)/I_{DRB,n} \to Ш(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X]). \tag{18}$$

It reduces any bracketed monomial to a DRB monomial. For example, if $u, v \in C(X)$, then

$$\mathrm{Red}(\lfloor u \rfloor \lfloor v \rfloor) = 1 \otimes u \otimes v + 1 \otimes v \otimes u + \lambda \otimes uv.$$

3. Weakly monomial order

In this section, we will give a weak form of the monomial order on filtered pieces of the set of differential Rota-Baxter monomials. It will be sufficient for us to establish the composition-diamond lemma for integro-differential algebras.

Let Y be a set with well order $\leq_Y$. Define the **length-lexicographic order** $\leq^*_{Y,\text{lex}}$ on the free monoid $M(Y)$ by

$$u <^*_{Y,\text{lex}} v \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \ell < m, \\ \text{or } \ell = m \text{ and } \exists 1 \leq i_0 \leq \ell \text{ such that } u_i = v_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i < i_0 \text{ and } u_{i_0} < v_{i_0}, \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

where $u = u_1 \cdots u_\ell$ and $v = v_1 \cdots v_m$ with $u_i \in Y, 1 \leq i \leq \ell, v_j \in Y, 1 \leq j \leq m, m, n \geq 1$. It is well-known [1] that $\leq^*_{Y,\text{lex}}$ is still a well order. An element $1 \neq u$ of the free commutative monoid $C(Y)$ can be uniquely expressed as

$$u = u_0^{j_0} \cdots u_k^{j_k}, \text{ where } u_0, \cdots, u_k \in Y, j_0, \cdots, j_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \text{ and } u_0 > \cdots > u_k. \tag{20}$$

This expression is called the **standard form** of u. If $k = -1$, we take $u \in \mathbf{k}$ by convention.

Any $1 \neq u \in C(Y)$ can also be expressed uniquely as

$$u = u_1 \cdots u_\ell,\ u_1 \geq u_2 \geq \cdots \geq u_\ell \in Y.$$

With this notation, $C(Y)$ can be identified with a subset of the free monoid $M(Y)$ on Y. Then the well order $<^*_{Y,\text{lex}}$ on $M(Y)$ restricts to a well order on $C(Y)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(Y, \leq_Y)$ is a well-ordered set and $u, v \in C(Y)$. If $u < v$, then $uw \leq^*_{Y,\text{lex}} vw$ for $w \in C(Y)$.*

Proof. Such a result is well-known for free noncommutative monoid. The proof for the commutative case is different and we sketch a proof for completeness.

From the standard decomposition of $u \in C(Y)$ in Eq. (20), u can be expressed uniquely as a function

$$f := f_u : Y \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0},\ f_u(y) = \begin{cases} j_i, & y = u_i, 1 \leq i \leq k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

Thus $C(Y)$ can be identified with

$$\mathcal{F} := \{ f : Y \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \,|\, \operatorname{Supp}(f) := Y \backslash f^{-1}(0) \text{ is finite } \}$$

with $1 \in C(Y)$ corresponding to $f_1 \equiv 0$. Denote $\deg(f) := \sum_{y \in Y} f(y)$. Under this identification, the order $\leq^*_{Y,\text{lex}}$ on $C(Y)$ is identified with the order $\leq$ on $\mathcal{F}$ defined by

$$f < g \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \deg(f) < \deg(g) \\ \text{or } \deg(f) = \deg(g) \text{ and } \exists y_0 \in Y \text{ such that } f(y) = g(y) \text{ for } y < y_0 \text{ and } f(y_0) < g(y_0). \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

Let $u, v, w \in C(Y)$ be given. We apply the identification of u, v, w with $f_u, f_v, f_w \in \mathcal{F}$ given in Eq (21). We note that $f_{uw} = f_u + f_w$ and $f_{vw} = f_v + f_w$. Thus we have

$$\deg(f_{uw}) = \deg(f_u) + \deg(f_w), \deg(f_{vw}) = \deg(f_v) + \deg(f_w), \text{ and } f_u(y) < f_v(y) \Leftrightarrow f_{uw}(y) < f_{vw}(y).$$

Then it follows that $f_u < f_v$ if and only if $f_{uw} < f_{vw}$. This proves the lemma. □

For a set X, recall that $\Delta X = \{x^{(k)} \mid x \in X, k \geq 0\}$ and $\Delta_n X := \{x^{(k)} \mid x \in X, 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ for $n \geq 0$. Then $C(\Delta_n X), n \geq 0$, define an increasing filtration on $C(\Delta X)$ and hence give a filtration $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\Delta X)$. Elements of $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ are called **DRB monomials of order** n.

Definition 3.2. Let X be a set, $\star$ a symbol not in X and $\Delta_n X^\star := \Delta_n(X \cup \{\star\})$.

(a) By a **$\star$-DRB monomial on** $\Delta_n X$, we mean any expression in $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X^\star)$ with exactly one occurrence of $\star$. The set of all $\star$-DRB monomials on $\Delta_n X$ is denoted by $\mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$.

(b) For $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and $u \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$, we define
$$q|_u := q|_{\star \mapsto u}$$
to be the bracketed monomial in $\mathfrak{C}(\Delta_n X)$ obtained by replacing the letter $\star$ in q by u, and call $q|_u$ a **u-monomial on** $\Delta_n X$.

(c) Further, for $s = \sum_i c_i u_i \in \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$, where $c_i \in \mathbf{k}$, $u_i \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ and $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$, we define
$$q|_s := \sum_i c_i q|_{u_i},$$
which is in $\mathbf{k}\,\mathfrak{C}(\Delta_n X)$.

We note that a $\star$-DRB monomial q is a DRB monomial in $\Delta_n X^\star$ while its substitution $q|_u$ might not be a DRB monomials. For example, for $q = P(x_1)\star \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X^\star)$ and $u = P(x_2) \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ where $x_1, x_2 \in X$, the u-monomial $q|_u = P(x_1)P(x_2)$ is no longer in $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let S be a subset of $\mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(\Delta_n(X))$ and* Id(S) *be the operated ideal of $\mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(\Delta_n(X))$ generated by S. Then*
$$\mathrm{Id(S)} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i q_i|_{s_i} \,\middle|\, c_i \in \mathbf{k}, q_i \in \mathfrak{C}^\star(\Delta_n X), s_i \in S, 1 \le i \le k, k \ge 1 \right\}.$$

Proof. It is easy to see that the right hand side is contained in the left side. On the other hand, the right hand side is already an operated ideal of $\mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(\Delta_n(X))$ containing S. ☐

Definition 3.4. If $q = p|_{d^\ell(\star)}$ for some $p \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 1}$, then we call q a **type I $\star$-DRB monomial**. Let $\mathcal{B}^\star_I(\Delta_n X)$ denote the set of type I $\star$-DRB monomials on $\Delta_n X$ and call
$$\mathcal{B}^\star_{II}(\Delta_n X) := \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X) \setminus \mathcal{B}^\star_I(\Delta_n X)$$
the set of **type II $\star$-DRB monomials**.

Lemma 3.5. *Any element $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ is one of the following three forms*

(a) *$q \in \mathcal{B}^\star_I(\Delta_n X)$, or*

(b) *$q = s \star t$ with $s \in C(\Delta_n X)$ and $t \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$, or*

(c) *$q = sP(p)$ for some $s \in C(\Delta_n X)$ and $p \in \mathcal{B}^\star_{II}(\Delta_n X)$.*

Proof. Any element $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ is of the form $u_0 \otimes u_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_k$ with $u_i \in C(\Delta_n X), 1 \le i \le k$, except a unique u_i which is in $C(\Delta_n X^\star)$ with exactly one occurrence of $\star$. In turn, this unique $u_i \in C(\Delta_n X^\star)$ is of the form $u_{i1} \cdots u_{im}$ with $u_{ij} \in \Delta_n X, 1 \le j \le m$, except a unique u_{ij} which is in $\Delta_n X^\star$ with exactly one occurrence of $\star$. Thus this unique $u_{ij} \in \Delta_n X^\star$ is of the for $d^\ell(\star)$ for some $\ell \ge 0$. If $\ell \ge 1$, then q is of type I. If $\ell = 0$, then $d^\ell(\star) = \star$. So if $i = 0$, namely this $\star$ is in u_0, then $q = (u_{01} \cdots u_{0(j-1)} \star u_{0(j+1)} \cdots u_{0m}) \otimes u_1 \otimes \cdots u_k$ is of the form $s \star t$ with $s = u_{01} \cdots u_{0(j-1)} u_{0(j+1)} \cdots u_{0m}$ and $t = 1 \otimes u_2 \cdots u_k$. If $i \ge 1$, then $q = sP(p)$, where $p := u_2 \otimes \cdots u_k \in \mathcal{B}^\star_{II}(\Delta_n X)$. This proves the lemma. ☐

Definition 3.6. Let X be a set, $\star_1$, $\star_2$ two distinct symbols not in X and $\Delta_n X^{\star_1,\star_2} := \Delta_n(X \cup \{\star_1, \star_2\})$. We define a **$(\star_1, \star_2)$-DRB monomial on** $\Delta_n X$ to be an expression in $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X^{\star_1,\star_2})$ with exactly one occurrence of $\star_1$ and exactly one occurrence of $\star_2$. The set of all $(\star_1, \star_2)$-DRB monomials on $\Delta_n X$ is denoted by $\mathcal{B}^{\star_1,\star_2}(\Delta_n X)$. For $q \in \mathcal{B}^{\star_1,\star_2}(\Delta_n X)$ and $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$, we define

$$q|_{u_1,u_2} := q|_{\star_1 \mapsto u_1, \star_2 \mapsto u_2}$$

to be the bracketed monomial obtained by replacing the letter $\star_1$ (resp. $\star_2$) in q by u_1 (resp. u_2) and call it a (u_1, u_2)**-bracketed monomial on** $\Delta_n X$.

A (u_1, u_2)-DRB monomial on $\Delta_n X$ can also be recursively defined by

$$q|_{u_1,u_2} := (q^{\star_1}|_{u_1})|_{u_2}, \tag{23}$$

where $q^{\star_1}$ is q when q is regarded as a $\star_1$-DRB monomial on the set $\Delta_n X^{\star_2}$. Then $q^{\star_1}|_{u_1}$ is in $\mathcal{B}^{\star_2}(\Delta_n X)$. Similarly, we have

$$q|_{u_1,u_2} := (q^{\star_2}|_{u_2})|_{u_1}. \tag{24}$$

Let X be a well-ordered set and let $Y = \Delta X$. Let $n \geq 0$ be given. For $x_0^{(i_0)}, x_1^{(i_1)} \in \Delta X$ (resp. $\Delta_n X$) with $x_0, x_1 \in X$, define

$$x_0^{(i_0)} \leq x_1^{(i_1)} \left(\text{resp.} x_0^{(i_0)} \leq_n x_1^{(i_1)}\right) \Leftrightarrow (x_0, -i_0) \leq (x_1, -i_1) \quad \text{lexicographically.} \tag{25}$$

For example $x^{(2)} < x^{(1)} < x$. Also, $x_1 < x_2$ implies $x_1^{(2)} < x_2^{(2)}$. Then by [1], the order $\leq_n$ is a well order on $\Delta_n X$ and hence is extended to a well order on $C(\Delta_n X)$ by Eq. (19) which we still denote by $\leq_n$.

We next extend the well order $\leq_n$ on $C(\Delta_n X)$ defined above to $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. Note that

$$\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X) = \{u_0 \otimes u_1 \otimes \cdots u_k \,|\, u_i \in C(\Delta_n X), 1 \leq i \leq k, k \geq 0\} = \sqcup_{k \geq 1} C(\Delta_n X)^{\otimes k}$$

can be identified with the free semigroup on the set $C(\Delta_n X)$. Thus the well order $\leq_n$ on $C(\Delta_n X)$ extends to a well order $\leq^*_{n,\mathrm{lex}}$ [1] which we will still denote by $\leq_n$ for simplicity. More precisely, for any $u = u_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_k \in C(\Delta_n X)^{\otimes(k+1)}$ and $v = v_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_\ell \in C(\Delta_n X)^{\otimes(\ell+1)}$, define

$$u \leq_n v \text{ if } (k+1, u_0, \cdots, u_k) \leq (\ell+1, v_0, \cdots, v_\ell) \text{ lexicographically.} \tag{26}$$

This is the order on $\mathfrak{B}(\Delta_n X)$ that we will consider in this paper.

Definition 3.7. Let $\leq_n$ be the well order on $\mathfrak{B}(\Delta_n X)$ defined in Eq. (26). Let $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and $s \in \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$.

(a) For any $0 \neq f \in \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$, let $\overline{f}$ denote the leading term of f: $f = c\overline{f} + \sum_i c_i u_i$, where $0 \neq c, c_i \in \mathbf{k}$, $u_i \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$, $u_i < \overline{f}$. f is called **monic** if $c = 1$.

(b) Denote

$$\overline{q|_s} := \overline{\mathrm{Red}(q|_s)},$$

where $\mathrm{Red} : \mathbf{k}\mathfrak{C}(\Delta_n X) \to \text{Ш}(\Delta_n X) = \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ is the reduction map in Eq. (18).

(c) The element $q|_s \in \mathbf{k}\,\mathfrak{C}(\Delta_n X)$ is called **normal** if $q|_{\overline{s}}$ is in $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. In other words, if $\mathrm{Red}(q|_{\overline{s}}) = q|_{\overline{s}}$.

Remark 3.8. (a) By definition, $q|_s$ is normal if and only if $q|_{\overline{s}}$ is normal if and only if the $\overline{s}$-DRB monomial $q|_{\overline{s}}$ is already a DRB monomial, that is, no further reduction in $\text{Ш}(\Delta_n X)$ is possible.

(b) Examples of not normal (abnormal) s-DRB monomials are
  (i) $q = \star P(x)$ and $\overline{s} = P(x)$, giving $q|_s = P(x)P(x)$ which is reduced to $P(xP(y)) + P(P(x)y) + \lambda P(xy)$ in $\text{Ш}(\Delta_n X)$;
  (ii) $q = d(\star)$ and $\overline{s} = P(x)$, giving $q|_{\overline{s}} = d(P(x))$ which is reduced to x in $\text{Ш}(\Delta_n X)$;

(iii) $q = d(\star)$ and $\overline{s} = x^2$, giving $q|_{\overline{s}} = d(x^2)$ which is reduced to $2xx^{(1)} + \lambda(x^{(1)})^2$ in $\text{Ш}(\Delta_n X)$;

(iv) $q = d^n(\star)$ and $\overline{s} = d(x)$, giving $q|_{\overline{s}} = d^{n+1}(s)$ which is reduced to 0 in $\text{Ш}(\Delta_n X)$.

Definition 3.9. A **weakly monomial order** on $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ is a well order $\geq$ satisfying the following condition:

$$\text{for } u, v \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X), u > v \Rightarrow \overline{q|_u} > \overline{q|_v} \text{ if either } q \in \mathcal{B}^\star_{II}(\Delta_n X), \text{ or } q \in \mathcal{B}^\star_I(\Delta_n X) \text{ and } q|_u \text{ is normal.}$$

We shall prove that the order defined in Eq. (26) is a weakly monomial order on $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. We need the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\ell \geq 1$ and $s \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. Then $d^\ell(\star)|_s$ is normal if and only if $s \in \Delta_{n-\ell} X$.*

Proof. If $\overline{s} \in \Delta_{n-\ell} X$, then $d^\ell(\overline{s})$ is in $\Delta_n X$ and hence $d^\ell(\star)|_s$ is normal. Conversely, if $\overline{s} \notin \Delta_{n-\ell} X$, then either $\operatorname{dep}(\overline{s}) \geq 2$, or $\operatorname{dep}(\overline{s}) = 1$ and $\deg_{\Delta_n X}(u) \geq 2$, or $\overline{s} \in \Delta_n X \setminus \Delta_{n-\ell} X$. In all these cases, $d^\ell(\star)|_s$ is not normal. □

Lemma 3.11. *Let $\leq_n$ be the order defined in Eq. (26). Let $u, v \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. If $u >_n v$ and $d^\ell(\star)|_u$ is normal, then $\overline{d^\ell(u)} >_n \overline{d^\ell(v)}$.*

Proof. We prove the result by induction on ℓ. We first consider $\ell = 1$ and prove $\overline{d(u)} >_n \overline{d(v)}$. Since $d(\star)|_u$ is normal, we have $u = x_1^{(i_1)} \in \Delta_{n-1} X$ by Lemma 3.10. Since $u >_n v$, by the definition of $>_n$, we have we have $v = x_2^{(i_2)} \in \Delta_n X$ with either $x_1 > x_2$ or $x_1 = x_2$ and $i_1 < i_2$. So $\overline{d(u)} >_n \overline{d(v)}$.

Next, suppose the result holds for $1 \leq m < \ell$. Then by the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\overline{d^\ell(u)} = \overline{d(d^{\ell-1}(u))} = \overline{d(\overline{d^{\ell-1}(u)})} >_n \overline{d(\overline{d^{\ell-1}(v)})} = \overline{d(d^{\ell-1}(v))} = \overline{d^\ell(v)}.$$

□

Proposition 3.12. *The order $\leq_n$ defined in Eq. (26) is a weakly monomial order.*

Proof. Let $u, v \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ with $u >_n v$ and $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$. By Lemma 3.5 we have the following three cases to consider.

Case 1. Consider $q = s \star t$ where $s \in C(\Delta_n X)$ and $t \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. Note that $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X) = C(\Delta_n X) \sqcup C(\Delta X)P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$. We consider the following four subcases depending on t or u in $C(\Delta_n X)$ or $C(\Delta X)P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$.

Subcase 1.1. Let $t, u \in C(\Delta_n X)$. Since $u >_n v$, we have that $v \in C(\Delta_n X)$ and so by Lemma 3.1, $\overline{q|_u} = sut >_n svt = \overline{q|_v}$.

Subcase 1.2. Let $t \in C(\Delta_n X)P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$ and $u \in C(\Delta_n X)$. Let $t = t_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes t_m$ with $m \geq 1$. Since $u >_n v$, we have $v \in C(\Delta_n X)$. By Lemma 3.1 and Eq. (26), we have

$$(m+1, sut_0, t_1, \cdots, t_m) > (m+1, svt_0, t_1, \cdots, t_m) \quad \text{lexicographically.}$$

So $\overline{q|_u} = (sut_0) \otimes t_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes t_m >_n (svt_0) \otimes t_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes t_m = \overline{q|_v}$.

Subcase 1.3. Let $t \in C(\Delta_n X)$ and $u \in C(\Delta_n X)P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$. Let $u = u_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_k$ with $k \geq 1$. If $v \in C(\Delta_n X)$, it is obvious that

$$\overline{q|_u} = (stu_0) \otimes \cdots \otimes u_k >_n \overline{q|_v} = svt.$$

If $v \in C(\Delta_n X)P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$, let $v = v_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_m$ with $m \geq 1$. Then $\overline{q|_v} = (stv_0) \otimes \cdots \otimes v_m$. Since $u >_n v$, by Eq. (26), we have that

$$(k+1, u_0, \cdots, u_k) > (m+1, v_0, \cdots, v_m) \quad \text{lexicographically.}$$

By Lemma 3.1, it follows that

$$(k+1, stu_0, u_1, \cdots, u_k) > (m+1, stv_0, v_1, \cdots, v_m) \quad \text{lexicographically,}$$

that is, $\overline{q|_u} >_n \overline{q|_v}$.

Subcase 1.4. Let $t, u \in C(\Delta_n X)P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$. Let $t = t_1 \otimes \tilde{t} = t_0 P(\tilde{t})$ and $u = u_0 \otimes \tilde{u} = u_0 P(\tilde{u})$, where $t_0, u_0 \in C(\Delta_n X), \tilde{t}, \tilde{u} \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. If $v \in C(\Delta_n X)$, then

$$\overline{q|_v} = (svt_0)P(\tilde{t}) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{q|_u} = \overline{st_0u_0P(\tilde{t})P(\tilde{u})} = st_0u_0\overline{P(\tilde{t})P(\tilde{u})}.$$

Thus $\operatorname{dep}(\overline{q|_u}) > \operatorname{dep}(\overline{q|_v})$ and so $\overline{q|_u} >_n \overline{q|_v}$. If $v \in C(\Delta X)P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$, let $v = v_0 \otimes \tilde{v} = v_0 P(\tilde{v})$. Then $\overline{q|_v} = \overline{st_0v_0P(\tilde{t})P(\tilde{v})} = st_0v_0\overline{P(\tilde{t})P(\tilde{v})}$. Since $u >_n v$, we have $\operatorname{dep}(\tilde{u}) + 1 = \operatorname{dep}(u) \geq \operatorname{dep}(v) = \operatorname{dep}(\tilde{v}) + 1$ by Eq. (26) and so $\operatorname{dep}(\tilde{u}) \geq \operatorname{dep}(\tilde{v})$. If $\operatorname{dep}(\tilde{u}) > \operatorname{dep}(\tilde{v})$, then $\operatorname{dep}(\overline{q|_u}) > \operatorname{dep}(\overline{q|_v})$ and so $\overline{q|_u} >_n \overline{q|_v}$. Suppose $\operatorname{dep}(\tilde{u}) = \operatorname{dep}(\tilde{v})$. Then $\operatorname{dep}(\overline{q|_u}) = \operatorname{dep}(\overline{q|_v})$. If $u_0 >_n v_0$, then $st_0u_0 >_n st_0v_0$ by Lemma 3.1 and so $\overline{q|_u} >_n \overline{q|_v}$ by Eq. (26). We are left to consider the case $\operatorname{dep}(\tilde{u}) = \operatorname{dep}(\tilde{v})$ and $u_0 = v_0$. In this case, since $u >_n v$, we have that $\tilde{u} >_n \tilde{v}$. If $\tilde{u} >_n \tilde{v} \geq \tilde{t}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{q|_u} &= (st_0u_0)\overline{P(\tilde{t})P(\tilde{u})} = (st_0u_0)P(\tilde{u}P(\tilde{t})) = (st_0u_0) \otimes \tilde{u} \otimes \tilde{t} \\ &>_n (st_0v_0) \otimes \tilde{v} \otimes \tilde{t} = (st_0v_0)P(\tilde{v}P(\tilde{t})) = (st_0v_0)\overline{P(\tilde{t})P(\tilde{v})} = \overline{q|_v}.\end{aligned}$$

If $\tilde{t} \geq \tilde{u} >_n \tilde{v}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{q|_u} &= (st_0u_0)\overline{P(\tilde{t})P(\tilde{u})} = (st_0u_0)P(\tilde{t}P(\tilde{u})) = (st_0u_0) \otimes \tilde{t} \otimes \tilde{u} \\ &>_n (st_0v_0) \otimes \tilde{t} \otimes \tilde{v} = (st_0u_0)P(\tilde{t}P(\tilde{v})) = (st_0u_0)\overline{P(\tilde{t})P(\tilde{v})} = \overline{q|_v}.\end{aligned}$$

If $\tilde{u} >_n \tilde{t} >_n \tilde{v}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{q|_u} &= (st_0u_0)\overline{P(\tilde{t})P(\tilde{u})} = (st_0u_0)P(\tilde{u}P(\tilde{t})) = (st_0u_0) \otimes \tilde{u} \otimes \tilde{t} \\ &>_n (st_0v_0) \otimes \tilde{t} \otimes \tilde{v} = (st_0u_0)P(\tilde{t}P(\tilde{v})) = (st_0u_0)\overline{P(\tilde{t})P(\tilde{v})} = \overline{q|_v}.\end{aligned}$$

Case 2. Consider $q = sP(p)$ for some $s \in C(\Delta_n X)$ and $p \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$. This case can be verified by induction on $\operatorname{dep}(q)$ and the fact that, for $u, v \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$, $u >_n v$ implies $P(u) >_n P(v)$.

Case 3. Consider $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star_I(\Delta_n X)$. Then $q = p|_{d^\ell(\star)}$ for some $p \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Take such ℓ maximal so that $p \in \mathcal{B}^\star_{II}(\Delta_n X)$. We need to show that if $u >_n v$ and $q|_u$ is normal, then $\overline{q|_u} >_n \overline{q|_v}$. But if $q|_u$ is normal then $d^\ell(\star)|_u$ is normal. Then by Lemma 3.11, we have $\overline{d^\ell(u)} >_n \overline{d^\ell(v)}$. Then by Cases 1 and 2, we have $\overline{q|_u} = \overline{p|_{\overline{d^\ell(u)}}} >_n \overline{p|_{\overline{d^\ell(v)}}} = \overline{q|_v}$. This completes the proof. □

We give the following consequences of Proposition 3.12 to be applied in Section 4.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and $s \in \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ be monic. If $q|_s$ is normal, then $\overline{q|_s} = q|_{\bar{s}}$.*

Proof. Let $s = \bar{s} + \sum_i c_i s_i$ with $0 \neq c_i \in \mathbf{k}$ and $s_i < \bar{s}$. Then $q|_s = q|_{\bar{s}} + \sum_i c_i q|_{s_i}$. Since $q|_s$ is normal, it follows that $q|_{\bar{s}} \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ and so $\overline{q|_{\bar{s}}} = q|_{\bar{s}}$. We have the following two cases to consider.

Case I. $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star_{II}(\Delta_n X)$. Then $\overline{q|_{s_i}} < \overline{q|_{\bar{s}}} = q|_{\bar{s}}$ by Definition 3.9 and Proposition 3.12. Hence $\overline{q|_s} = \overline{q|_{\bar{s}}} = q|_{\bar{s}}$.

Case II. $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star_I(\Delta_n X)$. Then $q = p|_{d^\ell(\star)}$ for some $p \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Since $q|_s = p|_{d^\ell(s)}$ is normal, we have $\bar{s} \in \Delta_{n-\ell} X$ by Lemma 3.10. Furthermore, $s_i < \bar{s}$ implies that $s_i \in \Delta_n X$. Thus by Definition 3.9 and Proposition 3.12, we have $\overline{q|_{s_i}} < q|_{\bar{s}}$. So $\overline{q|_s} = q|_{\bar{s}}$. □

Lemma 3.14. *Let $u, v \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ with $u > v$ and $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$. If $q|_u$ is normal, then either $q|_v = 0$ or $q|_v$ is also normal.*

Proof. Suppose that $q|_v$ is not normal. Then $q|_v \notin \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. We have the following cases to consider.

Case I. $\operatorname{dep}(v) \geq 2$, that is, $v \in C(\Delta_n X)P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$, and $q = p|_{\star P(w)}$ for some $p \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and $w \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. Since $u > v$, it follows that $\operatorname{dep}(u) \geq \operatorname{dep}(v) \geq 2$ and so $u \in C(\Delta_n X)P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$. This implies that $q|_u$ can be reduced by the Rota-Baxter relation and so $q|_u \notin \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. Hence $q|_u$ is not normal, a contradiction.

Case II. $q = p|_{d^\ell(\star)}$ for some $p \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and $\ell \geq 1$. If $\operatorname{dep}(v) \geq 2$, then since $u > v$, we have $\operatorname{dep}(u) \geq 2$ and so $u \in C(\Delta_n X)P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$. This implies that $q|_u$ is not normal, a contradiction. If $\operatorname{dep}(v) = 1$, then $v \in C(\Delta_n X)$. If further $\deg_{\Delta_n X}(v) \geq 2$, then since $u > v$, we have either $\operatorname{dep}(u) \geq 2$, or $\operatorname{dep}(u) = 1$ and $\deg_{\Delta_n X}(u) \geq 2$. In either case, we have that $q|_u$ is not normal, a contradiction. Thus we must have $\operatorname{dep}(v) = 1$ and $\deg_{\Delta_n X}(v) = 1$. So $v = x^{(r)}, r \geq 1$. Since $q|_v = p|_{d^\ell(v)} = p|_{x^{(\ell+r)}}$ is supposed to be not normal, we have $\ell + r > n$. That is, $q|_v = p|_{d^\ell(v)} = 0$. □

4. Composition-Diamond lemma

In this section, we shall establish the composition-diamond lemma for the order n free commutative differential Rota-Baxter algebra $\text{Ш}(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X])$.

Definition 4.1. (a) Let $u, w \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. We call u a **subword** of w if w is in the operated ideal of $\mathfrak{C}(\Delta_n X)$ generated by u. In terms of $\star$-words, u is a subword of w if there is a $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ such that $w = q|_u$.

(b) Let u_1 and u_2 be two subwords of w. u_1 and u_2 are called **separated** if $u_1 \in C(\Delta_n X)$, $u_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ and there is a $q \in \mathcal{B}^{\star_1,\star_2}(\Delta_n X)$ such that $w = q|_{u_1,u_2}$.

(c) For any $u \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$, u can be expressed as $u = u_1 \cdots u_k$, where $u_1, \cdots, u_{k-1} \in \Delta_n X$ and $u_k \in \Delta_n X \cup P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$. The integer k is called the **breath** of u and is denoted by $\operatorname{bre}(u)$.

(d) Let $f, g \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. A pair (u, v) with $u \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ and $v \in C(\Delta_n X)$ is called an **intersection pair** for (f, g) if the differential Rota-Baxter monomial $w := fu$ equals vg and satisfies $\operatorname{bre}(w) < \operatorname{bre}(f) + \operatorname{bre}(g)$. Then we call f and g to be **overlapping**. Note that if f and g are overlapping, then $f \in C(\Delta_n X)$.

There are four kinds of compositions.

Definition 4.2. Let $\leq$ be a weakly monomial order on $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ and $f, g \in \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ monic with respect to $\leq$.

(a) If $\overline{f} \in C(\Delta_n X)P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$, then define a **composition of (right) multiplication** to be fu where $u \in C(\Delta_n X)P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$.

(b) If $\overline{f} \notin \Delta_n X$, then define a **composition of derivation** to be $d^\ell(f)$, where $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$.

(c) If there is an intersection pair (u, v) for $(\overline{f}, \overline{g})$, then we define

$$(f, g)_w := (f, g)_w^{u,v} := fu - vg$$

and call it an **intersection composition** of f and g.

(d) If there exists a $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ such that $w := \overline{f} = q|_{\overline{g}}$, then we define $(f, g)_w := (f, g)_w^q := f - q|_g$ and call it an **including composition** of f and g with respect to q. Note that if this is the case, then $q|_g$ is normal.

In the last two cases, $(f, g)_w$ is called the **ambiguity** of the composition.

Definition 4.3. Let $\leq$ be a weakly monomial order on $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$, $S \subseteq \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ be a set of monic differential Rota-Baxter polynomials and $w \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$.

(a) An element $h \in \mathbf{k}\mathfrak{B}(\Delta_n X)$ is called **trivial mod** $[S]$ and denote this by

$$h \equiv 0 \bmod [S]$$

if $h = \sum_i c_i q_i|_{s_i}$, where $c_i \in \mathbf{k}$, $q_i \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$, $s_i \in S$, $q_i|_{s_i}$ is normal and $q_i|_{\overline{s_i}} \leq \overline{h}$. This applies in particular to a composition of multiplication fu and a composition of derivation $d^\ell(f)$ where $f \in \mathbf{k}\mathfrak{B}(\Delta_n X)$, $u \in P(\mathfrak{B}(\Delta_n X))$ and $\ell \geq 1$. We use $\bmod [S]$ to distinguish from the usual notion of $u \equiv 0 \bmod (S)$ when u is in the ideal generated by S.

(b) For $u, v \in \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$, we call u and v **congruent modulo** (S, w) and denote this by

$$u \equiv v \bmod (S, w)$$

if $u - v = \sum_i c_i q_i|_{s_i}$, where $c_i \in \mathbf{k}$, $q_i \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$, $s_i \in S$, $q_i|_{s_i}$ is normal and $\overline{q_i|_{s_i}} < w$.

(c) For $f, g \in \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ and suitable u, v or q that give an intersection composition $(f, g)_w^{u,v}$ or an including composition $(f, g)_w^q$, the composition is called **trivial modulo** (S, w) if

$$(f, g)_w^{u,v} \text{ or } (f, g)_w^q \equiv 0 \bmod (S, w).$$

(d) The set $S \subseteq \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ is a **Gröbner-Shirshov basis** if all compositions of multiplication and derivation are trivial mod $[S]$, and, for $f, g \in S$, all intersection compositions $(f, g)_w^{u,v}$ and all including compositions $(f, g)_w^q$ are trivial modulo (S, w).

We give some preparational lemmas before establishing the Composition-Diamond Lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\geq$ be the weakly monomial order on $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ defined in Eq. (26), $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$, $q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and $w \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ such that $w = q_1|_{\overline{s_1}} = q_2|_{\overline{s_2}}$, where each $q_i|_{s_i}$ is normal, $i = 1, 2$. If $\overline{s_1}$ and $\overline{s_2}$ are separated in w, then $q_1|_{s_1} \equiv q_2|_{s_2} \bmod (S, w)$.*

Proof. Let $q \in \mathcal{B}^{\star_1,\star_2}(\Delta_n X)$ be the $(\star_1, \star_2)$-DRB monomial obtained by replacing this occurrence of $\overline{s_1}$ in w by $\star_1$ and this occurrence of $\overline{s_2}$ in w by $\star_2$. Then we have

$$q^{\star_1}|_{\overline{s_1}} = q_2, q^{\star_2}|_{\overline{s_2}} = q_1 \text{ and } q|_{\overline{s_1},\overline{s_2}} = q_1|_{\overline{s_1}} = q_2|_{\overline{s_2}},$$

where in the first two equalities, we have identified $\mathcal{B}^{\star_2}(\Delta_n X)$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\star_1}(\Delta_n X)$ with $\mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$. Let $s_1 - \overline{s_1} = \sum_i c_i u_i$ and $s_2 - \overline{s_2} = \sum_j d_j v_j$ with $c_i, d_j \in \mathbf{k}$ and $u_i, v_j \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. Then by the linearity of s_1 and s_2 in $q|_{s_1,s_2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
q_1|_{s_1} - q_2|_{s_2} &= (q^{\star_2}|_{\overline{s_2}})|_{s_1} - (q^{\star_1}|_{\overline{s_1}})|_{s_2} \\
&= q|_{s_1,\overline{s_2}} - q|_{\overline{s_1},s_2} \\
&= q|_{s_1,\overline{s_2}} - q|_{s_1,s_2} + q|_{s_1,s_2} - q|_{\overline{s_1},s_2} \\
&= -q|_{s_1,s_2-\overline{s_2}} + q|_{s_1-\overline{s_1},s_2} \\
&= -(q^{\star_2}|_{s_2-\overline{s_2}})|_{s_1} + (q^{\star_1}|_{s_1-\overline{s_1}})|_{s_2} \\
&= -\sum_j d_j(q^{\star_2}|_{v_j})|_{s_1} + \sum_i c_i(q^{\star_1}|_{u_i})|_{s_2} \\
&= -\sum_j d_j q|_{s_1,v_j} + \sum_i c_i q|_{u_i,s_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $(q^{\star_1}|_{s_1})|_{\overline{s_2}} = q|_{s_1,\overline{s_2}} = (q^{\star_2}|_{\overline{s_2}})|_{s_1} = q_1|_{s_1}$ is normal and $v_j < \overline{s_2}$, by Definition 3.9 and Proposition 3.12, we have

$$\overline{q|_{s_1,v_j}} = \overline{(q^{\star_1}|_{s_1})|_{v_j}} < \overline{(q^{\star_1}|_{s_1})|_{\overline{s_2}}} = \overline{q_1|_{s_1}} = q_1|_{\overline{s_1}} = w.$$

Similarly, since $(q^{\star_2}|_{s_2})|_{\overline{s_1}} = q|_{\overline{s_1},s_2} = (q^{\star_1}|_{\overline{s_1}})|_{s_2} = q_2|_{s_2}$ is normal and $u_i < \overline{s_1}$, we have

$$\overline{q|_{u_i,s_2}} = \overline{(q^{\star_2}|_{s_2})|_{u_i}} < \overline{(q^{\star_2}|_{s_2})|_{\overline{s_1}}} = \overline{q_2|_{s_2}} = q_2|_{\overline{s_2}} = w.$$

Hence $q_1|_{s_1} \equiv q_2|_{s_2} \mod (S, w)$. □

For $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$, let $\mathrm{dep}_\star(q)$ be the depth of the symbol $\star$ in q. For example, $\mathrm{dep}_\star(q) = 1$ if $q = P(\star)$ and $\mathrm{dep}_\star(q) = 2$ if $q = P(xP(\star))$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\leq_n$ be the weakly monomial order on $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ defined in Eq. (26) and let $S \subseteq \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. If each composition of multiplication and derivation of S is trivial mod $[S]$, then, for $s \in S$ and $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$, $q|_s$ is trivial mod $[S]$:*

$$q|_s = \sum_i c_i q_i|_{s_i},$$

where, for each i, $0 \neq c_i \in \mathbf{k}$, $s_i \in S$, $q_i|_{s_i}$ is normal and $q_i|_{\overline{s_i}} \leq \overline{q|_s}$.

Proof. We have the following two cases to consider.

Case I. $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star_{II}(\Delta_n X)$. In this case, we prove the result by induction on $\mathrm{dep}_\star(q)$. If $\mathrm{dep}_\star(q) = 0$, then $q = u \star v$, where $u \in C(\Delta_n X)$ and $v \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. If $s \in S$ is such that $\bar{s} \in C(\Delta_n X)$ or $v \in C(\Delta_n X)$, then it is obvious that $q|_s$ is normal by Definition 3.7 (c). Suppose $\bar{s}, v \notin C(\Delta_n X)$. Then $\bar{s}, v \in C(\Delta_n X)P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$. Since the composition of multiplication of S is trivial mod $[S]$, we have

$$sv = \sum_i d_i p_i|_{t_i},$$

where $0 \neq d_i \in \mathbf{k}$, $t_i \in S$, $p_i|_{t_i}$ is normal and $p_i|_{\overline{t_i}} \leq \overline{sv}$. Let $q_i := up_i \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$. Since $u \in C(\Delta_n X)$, we have $q_i|_{t_i} = up_i|_{t_i}$ is normal. Moreover,

$$q|_s = usv = \sum_i d_i up_i|_{t_i} = \sum_i d_i q_i|_{t_i},$$

where $q_i|_{\overline{t_i}} = up_i|_{\overline{t_i}} \leq u\overline{sv} = \overline{usv} = \overline{q|_s}$. Hence $q|_s$ is trivial mod $[S]$.

Suppose the claim has been proved for $q \in C(\Delta_n X)$ with $\mathrm{dep}_\star(q) = k \geq 0$ and consider q with $\mathrm{dep}_\star(q) = k + 1$. Then $q = uP(p)$, where $u \in C(\Delta_n X)$ and $p \in \mathcal{B}^\star_{II}(\Delta_n X)$ with $\mathrm{dep}_\star(p) = k$. By the induction hypothesis we have $p|_s = \sum_i c_i p_i|_{t_i}$, where $0 \neq c_i \in \mathbf{k}$, $t_i \in S$, $p_i|_{t_i}$ is normal and $p_i|_{\overline{t_i}} \leq \overline{p|_s}$. Let $q_i := uP(p_i) \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$. Then $q|_s = \sum_i c_i q_i|_{t_i}$, $q_i|_{t_i} = uP(p_i|_{t_i})$ is normal and $q_i|_{\overline{t_i}} = uP(p_i|_{\overline{t_i}}) \leq uP(\overline{p|_s}) = \overline{uP(p|_s)} = \overline{q|_s}$, as desired. This completes the induction.

Case II. $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star_{I}(\Delta_n X)$. Then $q = p|_{d^\ell(\star)}$ for some $p \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and $\ell \geq 1$. Choose such an ℓ to be maximal so that p is in $\mathcal{B}^\star_{II}(\Delta_n X)$. By our hypothesis, the composition of derivation is trivial mod $[S]$. So $d^\ell(s) = \sum c_i p_i|_{s_i}$, where $0 \neq c_i \in \mathbf{k}$, $s_i \in S$, $p_i|_{s_i}$ is normal and $p_i|_{\overline{s_i}} \leq \overline{d^\ell(s)}$. Since p is in $\mathcal{B}^\star_{II}(\Delta_n X)$, by Cases I that has been proved above, the result holds. □

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\geq$ be the weakly monomial order on $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ defined in Eq. (26) and let $S \subseteq \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. If S is a Gröbner-Shirshov basis, then for each pair $s_1, s_2 \in S$ for which there exist $q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and $w \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ such that $w = q_1|_{\overline{s_1}} = q_2|_{\overline{s_2}}$ with $q_1|_{s_1}$ and $q_2|_{s_2}$ normal, we have $q_1|_{s_1} \equiv q_2|_{s_2}$ mod (S, w).*

Proof. Let $s_1, s_2 \in S$, $q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and $w \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ be such that $w = q_1|_{\overline{s_1}} = q_2|_{\overline{s_2}}$. According to the relative location of s_1 and s_2 in w, we have the following three cases to consider.

Case I. $\overline{s_1}$ and $\overline{s_2}$ are separated in w. This case is covered by Lemma 4.4.

Case II. $\overline{s_1}$ and $\overline{s_2}$ are overlapping in w. Then there are $u \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ and $v \in C(\Delta X)$ such that $w_1 := \overline{s_1}u = v\overline{s_2}$ is a subword in w with $\mathrm{bre}(w_1) < \mathrm{bre}(\overline{s_1}) + \mathrm{bre}(\overline{s_2})$. Since S is a Gröbner-Shirshov basis, we have

$$s_1u - vs_2 = \sum_j c_j p_j|_{t_j},$$

where $p_j|_{t_j}$ is normal and $\overline{p_j|_{t_j}} = p_j|_{\overline{t_j}} < \overline{s_1}u = v\overline{s_2} = w_1$.

Let $q \in \mathcal{B}^{\star_1,\star_2}(\Delta_n X)$ be obtained from q_1 by replacing $\star$ by $\star_1$, and the u on the right of $\star$ by $\star_2$. Let $p \in \mathcal{B}^{\star}(\Delta_n X)$ be obtained from q by replacing $\star_1\star_2$ by $\star$. Then we have

$$q^{\star_2}|_u = q_1, q^{\star_1}|_v = q_2 \text{ and } p|_{\overline{s_1}u} = q|_{\overline{s_1},u} = q_1|_{\overline{s_1}} = w,$$

where in the first two equalities, we have identified $\mathcal{B}^{\star_2}(\Delta_n X)$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\star_1}(\Delta_n X)$ with $\mathcal{B}^{\star}(\Delta X)$. Thus we have

$$q_1|_{s_1} - q_2|_{s_2} = (q^{\star_2}|_u)|_{s_1} - (q^{\star_1}|_v)|_{s_2} = p|_{s_1u - vs_2} = \sum_j c_j p|_{p_j|_{t_j}}.$$

Since $\overline{p_j|_{t_j}} < w_1$ and $p|_{w_1} = w \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ is normal, we have $p|_{\overline{p_j|_{t_j}}}$ is either zero or normal by Lemma 3.14. If $p|_{\overline{p_j|_{t_j}}} = 0$, there is nothing to prove. If $p|_{\overline{p_j|_{t_j}}}$ is normal, then by Lemma 3.13, we have $\overline{p|_{p_j|_{t_j}}} = p|_{\overline{p_j|_{t_j}}} < p|_{w_1} = w$. Hence $q_1|_{s_1} \equiv q_2|_{s_2} \bmod (S, w)$.

Case III. One of $\overline{s_1}$ or $\overline{s_2}$ is a subword of the other. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $\overline{s_1} = q|_{\overline{s_2}}$ for some $q \in \mathcal{B}^{\star}(\Delta_n X)$. Since $\overline{s_1} = q|_{\overline{s_2}} \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$, it follows that $q|_{s_2}$ is normal by Definition 3.7 and $\overline{q|_{s_2}} = q|_{\overline{s_2}}$. For the inclusion composition $(s_1, s_2)^{q}_{\overline{s_1}}$, since S is a Gröbner-Shirshov basis, we have $(s_1, s_2)^{q}_{\overline{s_1}} = s_1 - q|_{s_2} = \sum_j c_j p_j|_{t_j}$, where $c_j \in \mathbf{k}$, $p_j \in \mathcal{B}^{\star}(\Delta_n X)$, $t_j \in S$ and $p_j|_{t_j}$ is normal with $\overline{p_j|_{t_j}} < \overline{s_1}$. Let $p \in \mathcal{B}^{\star}(\Delta_n X)$ be obtained from q_1 by replacing $\star$ with q. Then $w = q_2|_{\overline{s_2}} = q_1|_{\overline{s_1}} = q_1|_{q|_{\overline{s_2}}} = p|_{\overline{s_2}}$. Since S is a Gröbner-Shirshov basis, by Cases I and II, we have

$$p|_{\overline{s_2}} - q_2|_{\overline{s_2}} = \sum_i d_i r_i|_{v_i},$$

where $d_i \in \mathbf{k}$, $r_i \in \mathcal{B}^{\star}(\Delta_n X)$, $v_i \in S$ and $r_i|_{v_i}$ is normal with $\overline{r_i|_{v_i}} = r_i|_{\overline{v_i}} < q_2|_{\overline{s_2}} = w$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
q_2|_{s_2} - q_1|_{s_1} &= (p|_{s_2} - \sum_i d_i r_i|_{v_i}) - q_1|_{s_1} \\
&= p|_{s_2} - q_1|_{s_1} - \sum_i d_i r_i|_{v_i} \\
&= q_1|_{q|_{s_2}} - q_1|_{s_1} - \sum_i d_i r_i|_{v_i} \\
&= -q_1|_{s_1 - q|_{s_2}} - \sum_i d_i r_i|_{v_i} \\
&= -\sum_j c_j q_1|_{p_j|_{t_j}} - \sum_i d_i r_i|_{v_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\overline{p_j|_{t_j}} < \overline{s_1}$ and $q_1|_{\overline{s_1}} = w \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ is normal by our hypothesis, we have $q_1|_{\overline{p_j|_{t_j}}} = 0$ or $q_1|_{\overline{p_j|_{t_j}}}$ is normal by Lemma 3.14. If $q_1|_{\overline{p_j|_{t_j}}} = 0$, there is noting to prove. If $q_1|_{\overline{p_j|_{t_j}}}$ is normal, then by Lemma 3.13, $\overline{q_1|_{p_j|_{t_j}}} = q_1|_{\overline{p_j|_{t_j}}} < q_1|_{\overline{s_1}} = w$. Hence $q_2|_{s_2} - q_1|_{s_1} \equiv 0 \bmod (S, w)$. □

Lemma 4.7. *Let* $\leq_n$ *be the weakly monomial order on* $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ *defined in Eq. (26),* $S \subseteq \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ *and* $\operatorname{Irr(S)} := \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X) \setminus \{q|_{\overline{s}} \mid q \in \mathcal{B}^{\star}(\Delta_n X), s \in S, q|_s$ *is normal* $\}$*. Then for any* $f \in \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$*,* f *has an expression*

$$f = \sum_i c_i u_i + \sum_j d_j q_j|_{s_j},$$

where $0 \neq c_i, d_j \in \mathbf{k}, u_i \in \operatorname{Irr(S)}, \overline{u_i} \leq \overline{f}$*,* $s_j \in S$*,* $q_j|_{s_j}$ *is normal and* $q_j|_{\overline{s_j}} \leq \overline{f}$*.*

Proof. Suppose the lemma does not hold and let f be a counterexample with minimal $\overline{f}$. Write $f = \sum_i c_i u_i$ where $0 \neq c_i \in \mathbf{k}$, $u_i \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ and $u_1 > u_2 > \cdots$. If $u_1 \in \operatorname{Irr(S)}$, then let $f_1 := f - c_1 u_1$. If $u_1 \notin \operatorname{Irr}(S)$, that is, there exists $s_1 \in S$ such that $u_1 = q_1|_{s_1}$ and $q_1|_{s_1}$ is normal, then let $f_1 := f - c_1 q_1|_{s_1}$. In both cases $\overline{f_1} < \overline{f}$. By the minimality of f, we have that f_1 has the desired expression. Then f also has the desired expression. This is a contradiction. □

Now we are ready to derive the Composition-Diamond Lemma.

Theorem 4.8. *(Composition-Diamond Lemma) Let* $\geq$ *be the weakly monomial order on* $\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ *defined in Eq. (26),* S_n *a set of monic DRB polynomials in* $\mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ *and* $\operatorname{Id(S_n)}$ *the Rota-Baxter ideal of* $\mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ *generated by* S_n*. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) S_n *is a Gröbner-Shirshov basis in* $\mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$*.*
(b) *If* $0 \neq f \in \operatorname{Id(S_n)}$*, then* $\overline{f} = q|_{\overline{s}}$ *for some* $q \in \mathcal{B}^{\star}(\Delta_n X)$*,* $s \in S_n$ *and* $q|_s$ *is normal.*
(c) $\operatorname{Irr(S_n)} := \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)\setminus\{q|_{\overline{s}} \mid q \in \mathcal{B}^{\star}(\Delta_n X), s \in S_n, q|_s$ *is normal*$\}$ *is a* $\mathbf{k}$*-basis of* $\mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)/\operatorname{Id(S_n)}$*. In other words,* $\mathbf{k}\operatorname{Irr(S_n)} \oplus \operatorname{Id(S_n)} = \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$*.*

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): Let $0 \neq f \in \operatorname{Id(S_n)}$. Then by Lemmas 3.3 and 4.5,

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i q_i|_{s_i}, \text{ where } 0 \neq c_i \in \mathbf{k}, s_i \in S_n, q_i|_{s_i} \text{ is normal}, 1 \leq i \leq k. \tag{27}$$

Let $w_i = q_i|_{s_i}, 1 \leq i \leq k$. We rearrange them in non-increasing order by

$$w_1 = w_2 = \cdots = w_m > w_{m+1} \geq \cdots \geq w_k.$$

If for each $0 \neq f \in \operatorname{Id(S_n)}$, there is a choice of the above sum such that $m = 1$, then $\overline{f} = q_1|_{s_1}$ and we are done. So suppose the implication (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) does not hold. Then there is a $0 \neq f \in \operatorname{Id(S_n)}$ such that for any expression in Eq. (27), we have that $m \geq 2$. Fix such an f and choose an expression in Eq. (27) such that $q_1|_{\overline{s_1}}$ is minimal and then with $m \geq 2$ minimal, that is, with the fewest $q_i|_{s_i}$ such that $q_i|_{\overline{s_i}} = q_1|_{\overline{s_1}}$. Since $m \geq 2$, we have $q_1|_{\overline{s_1}} = w_1 = w_2 = q_2|_{\overline{s_2}}$.

Since S_n is a Gröbner-Shirshov basis in $\mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$, by Lemma 4.6, we have

$$q_2|_{\overline{s_2}} - q_1|_{\overline{s_1}} = \sum_j d_j p_j|_{r_j},$$

where $d_j \in \mathbf{k}$, $r_j \in S_n$, $p_j \in \mathcal{B}^{\star}(\Delta X)$ and $p_j|_{r_j}$ are normal with $p_j|_{\overline{r_j}} < w_1$. Hence

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i q_i|_{s_i} = (c_1 + c_2) q_1|_{s_1} + c_3 q_3|_{s_3} + \cdots + c_m q_m|_{s_m} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{k} c_i q_i|_{s_i} + \sum_j c_2 d_j p_j|_{r_j}.$$

By the minimality of m, we must have $c_1 + c_2 = c_3 = \cdots = c_m = 0$. Then we obtain an expression of f in the form of Eq. (27) for which $q_1|_{\overline{s_1}}$ is even smaller, a contradiction.

(b) ⇒ (*c*): Obviously $0 \in \mathbf{k}\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n}) + \mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n}) \subseteq \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. Suppose the inclusion is proper. Then $\mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)\backslash(\mathbf{k}\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n})+\mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n}))$ contains only nonzero elements. Let $f \in \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)\backslash(\mathbf{k}\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n})+\mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n}))$ be such that

$$\overline{f} = \min\{\overline{g} \mid g \in \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X) \setminus (\mathbf{k}\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n}) + \mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n}))\}.$$

Case I. $\overline{f} \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n})$. Then $f \neq \overline{f}$ since $f \notin \mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n})$. By $\overline{f - \overline{f}} < \overline{f}$ and the minimality of $\overline{f}$, we must have $f - \overline{f} \in \mathbf{k}\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n}) + \mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n})$ and so $f \in \mathbf{k}\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n}) + \mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n})$, a contradiction.

Case II. $\overline{f} \notin \mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n})$. Then by the definition of $\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n})$, we have $\overline{f} = q|_{\overline{s}}$ for some $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta X)$, $s \in S_n$ and $q|_s$ is normal. Thus $\overline{q|_s} = q|_{\overline{s}} = \overline{f}$ and so $\overline{f - q|_s} < \overline{f}$. If $f = q|_s$, then $f \in \mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n})$, a contradiction. If $f \neq q|_s$, then $f - q|_s \neq 0$ with $\overline{f - q|_s} < \overline{f}$. By the minimality of $\overline{f}$, we have $f - q|_s \in \mathbf{k}\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n}) + \mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n})$. This implies that $f \in \mathbf{k}\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n}) + \mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n})$, again a contradiction.

Hence $\mathbf{k}\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n}) + \mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n}) = \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. Suppose $\mathbf{k}\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n}) \cap \mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n}) \neq 0$ and let $0 \neq f \in \mathbf{k}\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n}) \cap \mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n})$. Then

$$f = c_1 v_1 + c_2 v_2 + \cdots + c_k v_k,$$

where $v_1 > v_2 > \cdots > v_k \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n})$. Since $f \in \mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n})$, by Item (b), we have $v_1 = \overline{f} = q|_{\overline{s}}$ for some $q \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$, $s \in S_n$ and $q|_s$ is normal. This is a contradiction to the construction of $\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n})$. Therefore $\mathbf{k}\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n}) \oplus \mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n}) = \mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ and $\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n})$ is a $\mathbf{k}$-basis of $\mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta X)/\mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n})$.

(c) ⇒ (*a*) : Suppose $f, g \in S_n$ give an intersection or including composition. Let $F = fu$ and $G = vg$ in the case of intersection composition and let $F = f$ and $G = q|_g$ in the case of including composition. Then we have $w := \overline{F} = \overline{G}$. If $(f,g)_w = F - G = 0$, then there is nothing to prove. If $(f,g)_w \neq 0$, then we have

$$(f,g)_w = \sum_i c_i q_i, \quad 0 \neq c_i \in \mathbf{k}, q_1 > q_2 > \cdots > q_k \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X).$$

Then $q_i < \overline{F} = \overline{G} = w$. Since $(f,g)_w \in \mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n})$, by Item(c), we have that the q_i are not in $\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n})$. By the definition of $\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n})$, there are $q_i \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$, $s_i \in S_n$ such that $q_i = q_i|_{\overline{s_i}}$ and $q_i|_{s_i}$ is normal. Since $\overline{q_i|_{s_i}} = q_i|_{\overline{s_i}} < w$, we have $(f,g)_w \equiv 0 \bmod (S_n, w)$.

For any composition of multiplication fu where $f \in S_n$ and $u \in C(\Delta_n X)\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$, we have $fu \in \mathrm{Id}(S_n)$. By Lemma 4.7, it follows that $fu = \sum_i c_i q_i|_{s_i}$ where $0 \neq c_i \in \mathbf{k}$, $s_i \in S_n$, $q_i \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$, $q_i|_{s_i}$ is normal and $q_i|_{\overline{s_i}} \leq \overline{fu}$. Hence the composition of multiplication is trivial mod $[S_n]$.

For any composition of derivation $d^\ell(f)$ where $f \in S_n$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, we have $d^\ell(f) \in \mathrm{Id}(\mathrm{S_n})$. By Lemma 4.7, we have $d^\ell(f) = \sum_i c_i q_i|_{s_i}$ where $0 \neq c_i \in \mathbf{k}$, $s_i \in S_n$, $q_i \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$, $q_i|_{s_i}$ is normal and $q_i|_{\overline{s_i}} \leq \overline{fP(v)}$. Hence the composition of derivation $d^\ell(f)$ is trivial mod $[S_n]$.

Therefore S_n is a Gröbner-Shirshov basis. □

5. GROÖBNER-SHIRSHOV BASES AND FREE COMMUTATIVE INTEGRO-DIFFERENTIAL ALGEBRAS

In this section we begin with a finite set X and prove that the relation ideal of the free commutative differential Rota-Baxter algebra on X of order n, where $n \geq 1$, that defines the corresponding commutative integro-differential algebra of order n possesses a Gröbner-Shirshov basis. This is done in Section 5.1. Then in Section 5.2, we apply the Composition-Diamond Lemma in Theorem 4.8 to construct a canonical basis for the commutative integro-differential algebra of order n. Taking n to go to the infinity, we obtain a canonical basis of the free commutative integro-differential algebra on the finite set X. Finally for any well-ordered set X, by showing that the canonical basis of the free commutative integro-differential algebra on each finite subset of X is compatible with the inclusion of the subset in X, we obtain a canonical basis of the free commutative integro-differential algebra on X.

5.1. **Gröbner-Shirshov basis.** We begin with a lemma that simplifies the defining ideal of the integro-differential algebra.

Lemma 5.1. *Let X be a finite set and let $\text{Ш}(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X])$ be the free commutative differential Rota-Baxter algebra on X. The differential Rota-Baxter ideal of $\text{Ш}(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X])$ generated by the set*

$$\left\{P(d(u)P(v)) - uP(v) + P(uv) + \lambda P(d(u)v) \,\middle|\, u, v \in \text{Ш}(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X]).\right\}$$

is generated by

$$S_n := \left\{P(d(u)P(v)) - uP(v) + P(uv) + \lambda P(d(u)v) \,\middle|\, u, v \in \text{Ш}(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X]), u \notin P(\text{Ш}(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X]))\right\}. \tag{28}$$

Proof. If u is in $P(\text{Ш}(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X]))$, let $u = P(\hat{u})$ for some $\hat{u} \in \text{Ш}(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X])$. Then $P(d(u)P(v)) - uP(v) + P(uv) + \lambda P(d(u)v)$ vanishes since P is a Rota-Baxter algebra. This proves the lemma. ◻

We show that S_n is a Gröbner-Shirshov basis of the ideal $\mathrm{Id}(S_n) \subseteq \text{Ш}(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X])$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\phi(u, v) \in S_n$ with $u \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X) \setminus P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$ and $v \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. Then $\overline{\phi(u, v)} = 1 \otimes \overline{d(u_0)} \otimes w$ for some $u_0 \in C(\Delta_n X)$ and $w \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$.*

Proof. Let $u = u_0 \otimes \hat{u}$ with $1 \neq u_0 \in C(\Delta_n X)$ and $\hat{u} \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ (take $\hat{u} = 1 \in \mathbf{k}$ when $u \in C(\Delta_n X)$). Then

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\phi(u, v)} &= \overline{P(d(u)P(v))} = \overline{P(d(u_0 \otimes \hat{u})(1 \otimes v))} = \overline{P(d(u_0) \otimes (\hat{u} \text{Ш}_\lambda v))} \\ &= \overline{P(d(u_0) \otimes w)} = P(\overline{d(u_0)} \otimes w) = 1 \otimes \overline{d(u_0)} \otimes w,\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where $w = \overline{\hat{u} \text{Ш}_\lambda v} \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. ◻

By the above lemma, we see that $\overline{\phi(u, v)} \in P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$ and so $\overline{\phi(u, v)} \notin C(\Delta_n X)$. So from Definition 4.1, there is no intersection compositions in S_n. The following two lemmas show that other kinds of compositions in S_n are trivial.

Lemma 5.3. *The compositions of multiplication and derivation are trivial mod $[S_n]$.*

Proof. Let

$$f := \phi(u, v) := P(d(u)P(v)) - uP(v) + P(uv) + \lambda P(d(u)v) \in S_n,$$

where $u \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X) \setminus P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$ and $v \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. First, we check that the compositions of derivation are trivial mod (S_n). By Eq. (6) and Eq. (8), we have

$$d(f) = d(u)P(v) - d(uP(v)) + uv + \lambda d(u)v = d(u)P(v) - d(u)P(v) - uv - \lambda d(u)v + uv + \lambda d(u)v = 0.$$

Hence $d^\ell(f) \equiv 0 \bmod [S_n]$ for any $\ell \in \geq 1$.

Next, we check that the compositions of multiplication $\phi(u, v)w_0 P(w)$ with $w_0 \in C(\Delta_n X)$ and $w \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$ are trivial. Since $w_0 \in C(\Delta_n X)$, it is sufficient to show that $\phi(u, v)P(w)$ is trivial. Note that $\overline{\phi(u, v)} \in P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$ by Lemma 5.2. From Eq. (7) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(u, v)P(w) =& P(d(u)P(v))P(w) - (uP(v))P(w) + P(uv)P(w) + \lambda P(d(u)v)P(w) \\ =& P(P(d(u)P(v))w) + P(d(u)P(v)P(w)) + \lambda P(d(u)P(v)w) \\ & - uP(v)P(w) + P(uv)P(w) + \lambda P(d(u)v)P(w) \\ =& P(P(d(u)P(v))w) + P(d(u)P(P(v)w + vP(w) + \lambda vw)) + \lambda P(d(u)P(v)w) \\ & - uP(v)P(w) + P(uv)P(w) + \lambda P(d(u)v)P(w)\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Since $\phi(u,v) = P(d(u)P(v)) - uP(v) + P(uv) + \lambda P(d(u)v)$, we have

$$P(P(d(u)P(v))w) = P(\phi(u,v)w) + P(uP(v)w) - P(P(uv)w) - \lambda P(P(d(u)v)w), \tag{31}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &P(d(u)P(P(v)w + vP(w) + \lambda vw))\\ =&\phi(u, P(v)w + vP(w) + \lambda vw) + uP(P(v)w + vP(w) + \lambda vw)\\ &- P(u(P(v)w + vP(w) + \lambda vw)) - \lambda P(d(u)(P(v)w + vP(w) + \lambda vw))\\ =&\phi(u, P(v)w + vP(w) + \lambda vw) + uP(wP(v)) + uP(vP(w)) + \lambda uP(vw) - P(uwP(v))\\ &- P(uvP(w)) - \lambda P(uvw) - \lambda P(d(u)wP(v)) - \lambda P(d(u)vP(w)) - \lambda^2 P(d(u)vw) \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &- uP(v)P(w) + P(uv)P(w) + \lambda P(d(u)v)P(w)\\ =&- uP(P(v)w) - uP(vP(w)) - \lambda uP(vw) + P(P(uv)w) + P(uvP(w)) + \lambda P(uvw)\\ &+ \lambda P(P(d(u)v)w) + \lambda P(d(u)vP(w)) + \lambda^2 P(d(u)vw). \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Substituting Eq. (31), Eq. (32) and Eq. (33) into Eq. (30), we have

$$\phi(u,v)P(w) = P(\phi(u,v)w) + \phi(u, wP(v)) + \phi(u, vP(w)) + \lambda\phi(u, vw)$$

The last three terms are already in S_n and hence are of the form $q|_s$ with $q = \star$ and $s \in S_n$. So we just need to bound the leading terms. Note that

$$\overline{P(aP(b))}, \overline{P(bP(a))}, \overline{P(ab)} \leq \overline{P(a)P(b)} \text{ for } a, b \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X).$$

So we have

$$\overline{\phi(u, wP(v))} = \overline{P(d(u)P(wP(v)))} \leq \overline{P(d(u)P(v)P(w))} \leq \overline{P(d(u)P(v))P(w)} = \overline{\phi(u,v)P(w)}.$$

We similarly show that $\overline{\phi(u, vP(w))}, \overline{\phi(u, vw)} \leq \overline{\phi(u,v)P(w)}$. So $\phi(u, wP(v)) + \phi(u, vP(w)) + \lambda\phi(u, vw) \equiv 0 \bmod [S_n]$. Hence $\phi(u,v)P(w) \equiv 0 \bmod [S_n]$ if and only if $P(\phi(u,v)w) \equiv 0 \bmod [S_n]$. We prove the latter statement by induction on $\operatorname{dep}(w)$.

If $\operatorname{dep}(w) = 1$, that is, $w \in C(\Delta_n X)$, let $q := P(\star w) \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$. Then $q|_{\phi(u,v)} = P(\phi(u,v)w)$ and $q|_{\phi(u,v)}$ is normal by $w \in C(\Delta_n X)$. Since

$$\overline{P(\phi(u,v)w)} = \overline{P(\overline{\phi(u,v)}w)} = \overline{P(P(d(u)P(v))w)} \leq \overline{P(d(u)P(v))P(w)} = \overline{\overline{\phi(u,v)}P(w)} = \overline{\phi(u,v)P(w)},$$

we have $P(\phi(u,v)w) \equiv 0 \bmod [S_n]$.

Suppose $w \in C(\Delta_n X)P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X))$ and let $w = w_1 P(\tilde{w})$ with $w_1 \in C(\Delta_n X)$ and $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. Since $\operatorname{dep}(\tilde{w}) < \operatorname{dep}(w)$, by the induction hypothesis, we may assume that

$$\phi(u,v)P(\tilde{w}) = \sum_i c_i p_i|_{s_i},$$

where $0 \neq c_i \in \mathbf{k}$, $p_i \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$, $s_i \in S_n$, $p_i|_{s_i}$ is normal and $\overline{p_i|_{s_i}} \leq \overline{\phi(u,v)P(\tilde{w})}$. Let $q_i := P(w_1 p_i)$. Since $p_i|_{s_i}$ is normal and $w_1 \in C(\Delta_n X)$, it follows that $q_i|_{s_i}$ is normal. Furthermore, we have

$$P(\phi(u,v)w) = P(\phi(u,v)w_1 P(\tilde{w})) = \sum_i c_i P(w_1 p_i|_{s_i}) = \sum_i c_i q_i|_{s_i}$$

and

$$\overline{q_i|_{s_i}} = \overline{P(w_1 p_i|_{s_i})} \leq \overline{P(w_1 \phi(u,v)P(\tilde{w}))} = \overline{P(\phi(u,v)w)} \leq \overline{\phi(u,v)P(w)}.$$

Therefore $P(\phi(u,v)w) \equiv 0 \bmod [S_n]$. This completes the induction. Hence $\phi(u,v)P(w) \equiv 0 \bmod [S_n]$, as needed. □

Lemma 5.4. *The including compositions in S_n are trivial.*

Proof. We need to show that the ambiguities of all possible including compositions of the polynomials in S_n are trivial. The ambiguities of all such compositions are of the form

$$P(d(u)P(q|_{P(d(v)P(w))})) \text{ and } P(d(q|_{P(d(u)P(v))})P(w)).$$

Let two elements f and g of S_n be given. They are of the form

$$f := \phi(u,v), \quad g := \phi(r,s), \quad u, v \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X) \setminus P(\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)) \text{ and } r, s \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X).$$

Case I. Suppose $v = p|_{\overline{g}} = p|_{\overline{\phi(r,s)}} = p|_{P(d(r)P(s))}$ for some $p \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and

$$w := \overline{f} = \overline{\phi(u,v)} = \overline{P(d(u)P(v))} = \overline{P(d(u)P(p|_{\overline{g}}))} = \overline{q|_{\overline{g}}} = q|_{\overline{g}},$$

with $q = P(d(u)P(p)) \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and $q|_g$ being normal. Then

$$f = \phi(u,v) = P(d(u)P(p|_{P(d(r)P(s))})) - uP(p|_{P(d(r)P(s))}) + P(up|_{P(d(r)P(s))}) + \lambda P(d(u)p|_{P(d(r)P(s))})$$

and

$$q|_g = q|_{\phi(r,s)} = P(d(u)P(p|_{P(d(r)P(s))})) - P(d(u)P(p|_{rP(s)})) + P(d(u)P(p|_{P(rs)})) + \lambda P(d(u)P(p|_{P(d(r)s)})).$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}(f,g)_w :=& f - q|_g \\ =& -uP(p|_{P(d(r)P(s))}) + P(up|_{P(d(r)P(s))}) + \lambda P(d(u)p|_{P(d(r)P(s))}) \\ &+ P(d(u)P(p|_{rP(s)})) - P(d(u)P(p|_{P(rs)})) - \lambda P(d(u)P(p|_{P(d(r)s)})).\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Since $\phi(u,v) = P(d(u)P(v)) - uP(v) + P(uv) + \lambda P(d(u)v)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}-uP(p|_{P(d(r)P(s))}) &= -uP(p|_{\phi(r,s)}) - uP(p|_{rP(s)}) + uP(p|_{P(rs)}) + \lambda uP(p|_{P(d(r)s)}) \\ P(up|_{P(d(r)P(s))}) &= +P(up|_{\phi(r,s)}) + P(up|_{rP(s)}) - P(up|_{P(rs)}) - \lambda P(up|_{P(d(r)s)}) \\ \lambda P(d(u)p|_{P(d(r)P(s))}) &= +\lambda P(d(u)p|_{\phi(r,s)}) + \lambda P(d(u)p|_{rP(s)}) - \lambda P(d(u)p|_{P(rs)}) - \lambda^2 P(d(u)p|_{P(d(r)s)}) \\ P(d(u)P(p|_{rP(s)})) &= \phi(u, p|_{rP(s)}) + uP(p|_{rP(s)}) - P(up|_{rP(s)}) - \lambda P(d(u)p|_{rP(s)}) \\ -P(d(u)P(p|_{P(rs)})) &= -\phi(u, p|_{P(rs)}) - uP(p|_{P(rs)}) + P(up|_{P(rs)}) + \lambda P(d(u)p|_{P(rs)}) \\ -\lambda P(d(u)P(p|_{P(d(r)s)})) &= -\lambda\phi(u, p|_{P(d(r)s)}) - \lambda uP(p|_{P(d(r)s)}) + \lambda P(up|_{P(d(r)s)}) + \lambda^2 P(d(u)p|_{P(d(r)s)}).\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

From Eq. (34) and Eq. (35), it follows that

$$(f,g)_w = -uP(p|_{\phi(r,s)}) + P(up|_{\phi(r,s)}) + \lambda P(d(u)p|_{\phi(r,s)}) + \phi(u, p|_{rP(s)}) - \phi(u, p|_{P(rs)}) - \lambda\phi(u, p|_{P(d(r)s)}).$$

By Lemma 3.3, we have

$$uP(p|_{\phi(r,s)}), P(up|_{\phi(r,s)}), \lambda P(d(u)p|_{\phi(r,s)}) \in Id(S_n)$$

and

$$\phi(u, p|_{rP(s)}), \phi(u, p|_{P(rs)}), \phi(u, p|_{P(d(r)s)}) \in S_n \subseteq Id(S_n).$$

Since

$$\overline{uP(p|_{\phi(r,s)})}, \quad \overline{P(up|_{\phi(r,s)})}, \quad \overline{P(d(u)p|_{\phi(r,s)})} < \overline{\phi(u, p|_{\phi(r,s)})} = \overline{\phi(u,v)} = w$$

and

$$\overline{\phi(u, p|_{rP(s)})}, \quad \overline{\phi(u, p|_{P(rs)})}, \quad \overline{\phi(u, p|_{P(d(r)s)})} < \overline{\phi(u, p|_{\overline{\phi(r,s)}})} = \overline{\phi(u,v)} = w,$$

we have that $(f,g)_w \equiv 0 \bmod (S_n, w)$.

Case II. Suppose $u = p|_{\overline{g}} = p|_{\overline{\phi(r,s)}} = p|_{P(d(r)P(s))}$ for some $p \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and

$$w := \overline{f} = \overline{\phi(u,v)} = \overline{P(d(u)P(v))} = \overline{P(d(p|_{\overline{\phi(r,s)}})P(v))} = \overline{q|_{\overline{g}}} = q|_{\overline{g}},$$

with $q = P(d(p)P(v)) \in \mathcal{B}^\star(\Delta_n X)$ and $q|_g$ being normal. Then

$$f = \phi(u, v) = P(d(p|_{P(d(r)P(s))})P(v)) - p|_{P(d(r)P(s))}P(v) + P(p|_{P(d(r)P(s))}v) + \lambda P(d(p|_{P(d(r)P(s))})v)$$

and

$$q|_g = q|_{\phi(r,s)} = P(d(p|_{P(d(r)P(s))})P(v)) - P(d(p|_{rP(s)})P(v)) + P(d(p|_{P(rs)})P(v)) + \lambda P(d(p|_{P(d(r)s)})P(v)).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
(f, g)_w :=& f - q|_g \\
=& - p|_{P(d(r)P(s))}P(v) + P(p|_{P(d(r)P(s))}v) + \lambda P(d(p|_{P(d(r)P(s))})v) \\
&+ P(d(p|_{rP(s)})P(v)) - P(d(p|_{P(rs)})P(v)) - \lambda P(d(p|_{P(d(r)s)})P(v)) \\
=& - p|_{\phi(r,s)}P(v) - p|_{rP(s)}P(v) + p|_{P(rs)}P(v) + \lambda p|_{P(d(r)s)}P(v) \\
&+ P(p|_{\phi(r,s)}v) + P(p|_{rP(s)}v) - P(p|_{P(rs)}v) - \lambda P(p|_{P(d(r)s)}v) \\
&+ \lambda P(d(p|_{\phi(r,s)})v) + \lambda P(d(p|_{rP(s)})v) - \lambda P(d(p|_{P(rs)})v) - \lambda^2 P(d(p|_{P(d(r)s)})v) \\
&+ \phi(p|_{rP(s)}, v) + p|_{rP(s)}P(v) - P(p|_{rP(s)}v) - \lambda P(d(p|_{rP(s)})v) \\
&- \phi(p|_{P(rs)}, v) - p|_{P(rs)}P(v) + P(p|_{P(rs)}v) + \lambda P(d(p|_{P(rs)})v) \\
&- \lambda\phi(p|_{P(d(r)s)}, v) - \lambda p|_{P(d(r)s)}P(w) + \lambda P(p|_{P(d(r)s)}v) + \lambda^2 P(d(p|_{P(d(r)s)})v) \\
=& - p|_{\phi(r,s)}P(v) + P(p|_{\phi(r,s)}v) + \lambda P(d(p|_{\phi(r,s)})v) + \phi(p|_{rP(s)}, v) - \phi(p|_{P(rs)}, v) - \lambda\phi(p|_{P(d(r)s)}, v).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.3, we have

$$p|_{\phi(r,s)}P(v), P(p|_{\phi(r,s)}v), P(d(p|_{\phi(r,s)})v) \in Id(S_n)$$

and

$$\phi(p|_{rP(s)}, v), \phi(p|_{P(rs)}, v), \phi(p|_{P(d(r)s)}, v) \in S_n \subseteq Id(S_n).$$

Since

$$\overline{p|_{\phi(r,s)}P(v)}, \quad \overline{P(p|_{\phi(r,s)}v)}, \quad \overline{P(d(p|_{\phi(r,s)})v)} < \overline{\phi(p|_{\phi(r,s)}, v)} = \overline{\phi(u, v)} = w$$

and

$$\overline{\phi(p|_{rP(s)}, v)}, \quad \overline{\phi(p|_{P(rs)}, v)}, \quad \overline{\phi(p|_{P(d(r)s)}, v)} < \overline{\phi(p|_{\overline{\phi(r,s)}}, v)} = \overline{\phi(u, v)} = w,$$

it follows that $(f, g)_w \equiv 0 \mod (S_n, w)$. □

By the remark before Lemma 5.3, Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4, it follows immediately that

Theorem 5.5. *S_n is a Gröbner-Shirshov basis in $\mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. Hence $\mathrm{Irr}(S_n)$ in Theorem 4.8 is a linear basis of $Ш(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X])/\mathrm{Id}(S_n)$.*

5.2. **Bases for free commutative integro-differential algebras.** We next identify $\mathrm{Irr}(S_n)$ and thus obtaining a canonical basis of $Ш(\mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X])/\mathrm{Id}(S_n)$.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\leq$ be the linear order on $C(\Delta X)$ defined in Eqs. (25) and (19), and $u = u_0 u_1 \cdots u_k \in C(\Delta X)$ with $u_0, \cdots, u_k \in \Delta X$ and $u_0 \geq \cdots \geq u_k$. Then $\overline{d_X(u)} = u_0 u_1 \cdots u_{k-1} d_X(u_k)$. If u is in $C(\Delta_n X)$, then $\overline{d_X(u)} = u_0 u_1 \cdots u_{k-1} d_X(u_k)$ provided $u_k \in \Delta_{n-1} X$.*

Proof. We prove the first statement by induction on $k \geq 0$. If $k = 0$, then $u = u_0 \in \Delta X$ and there is nothing to prove.

Assume the result holds for $k \leq m$, where $m \geq 0$, and consider the case when $k = m + 1$. Then $u = u_0 u_1 \cdots u_{m+1}$ with $u_0, \cdots, u_{m+1} \in \Delta X$ and $u_0 \geq \cdots \geq u_{m+1}$. Let $\hat{u} = u_0 u_1 \cdots u_m$. Then

$$d_X(u) = d_X(\hat{u} u_{m+1}) = \hat{u} d_X(u_{m+1}) + d_X(\hat{u}) u_{m+1} + \lambda d_X(\hat{u}) d(u_{m+1}).$$

By the induction hypothesis, we have $\overline{d_X(\hat{u})} = u_0u_1\cdots d_X(u_m)$. So $\overline{d_X(\hat{u})u_{m+1}} = u_0u_1\cdots d_X(u_m)u_{m+1}$ and $\overline{d_X(\hat{u})d_X(u_{m+1})} = u_0u_1\cdots d_X(u_m)d_X(u_{m+1})$. If $d_X(u_m) \geq u_{m+1}$, then since $u_m > d_X(u_m)$ and $u_{m+1} > d_X(u_{m+1})$, we have

$$\hat{u}d_X(u_{m+1}) = u_0u_1\cdots u_m d_X(u_{m+1}) > u_0u_1\cdots d_X(u_m)u_{m+1} > u_0u_1\cdots d_X(u_m)d_X(u_{m+1})$$

and so $\overline{d_X(u)} = u_0u_1\cdots u_m d_X(u_{m+1})$. If $u_{m+1} > d_X(u_m)$ and $u_m > u_{m+1}$, then since $u_m > d_X(u_m)$, we have

$$\hat{u}d_X(u_{m+1}) = u_0u_1\cdots u_m d_X(u_{m+1}) > u_0u_1\cdots u_{m+1}d_X(u_m), u_0u_1\cdots d_X(u_m)d_X(u_{m+1})$$

and hence $\overline{d_X(u)} = u_0u_1\cdots u_m d_X(u_{m+1})$. If $u_{m+1} > d_X(u_m)$ and $u_m = u_{m+1}$, then since $u_m > d_X(u_m)$, we have

$$\hat{u}d_X(u_{m+1}) = u_0u_1\cdots u_m d_X(u_{m+1}) = u_0u_1\cdots u_{m+1}d_X(u_m) > u_0u_1\cdots d_X(u_m)d_X(u_{m+1})$$

and so $\overline{d_X(u)} = u_0u_1\cdots u_m d_X(u_{m+1})$. This completes the induction. The proof of the second statement then follows since under the condition $u_k \in \Delta_{n-1}X$, $d_X(u_k)$ does not change in ΔX or in $\Delta_n X$. $\square$

We now give the key concept to define $\mathrm{Irr}(S_n)$.

Definition 5.7. Let $u \in C(\Delta X)$ with standard form in Eq. (20):

$$u = u_0^{j_0}\cdots u_k^{j_k}, \text{ where } u_0, \cdots, u_k \in \Delta X, u_0 > \cdots > u_k \text{ and } j_0, \cdots, j_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}.$$

Call u **functional** if either $u \in \{1\} \cup X$ or $j_k > 1$. Denote

$$\mathcal{A}_f := \{u \in C(\Delta_n X) \,|\, u \text{ is functional }\}, \quad \mathbf{k}\{X\}_f := \mathbf{k}\mathcal{A}_f \text{ and } A_{f,0} = \mathbf{k}(\mathcal{A}_f \backslash \{1\}).$$

Proposition 5.8. *Let X be a finite well-ordered set. Let $(A, d_X) := (\mathbf{k}\{X\}, d_X) := (\mathbf{k}[\Delta X], d_X)$ be the free commutative differential algebra on X. Then $A = A_f \oplus d_X(A)$.*

Proof. We prove the result by induction on $|X| \geq 1$. The case when $|X| = 1$ has been proved in [23]. Suppose the result holds for all X such that $|X| < m$ and consider the case when $|X| = m$. Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_m\}$ with $x_1 > \cdots > x_m$, $B = \mathbf{k}\{x_1, \cdots, x_{m-1}\}$ and $C = \mathbf{k}\{x_m\}$. Also denote

$$A_f := \mathbf{k}\{X\}_f,\ B_f := \mathbf{k}\{x_1, \cdots, x_{m-1}\}_f,\ C_f := \mathbf{k}\{x_m\}_f,\ C_{f,0} = \mathbf{k}\{x_m\}_{f,0}.$$

By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$B = B_f \oplus d_X(B) \text{ and } C = C_f \oplus d_X(C).$$

Then by the definition of A_f, we have

$$A_f = (B_f\otimes\mathbf{k})\oplus(B\otimes C_{f,0}) = (B_f\otimes\mathbf{k})\oplus(B_f\otimes C_{f,0})\oplus(d_X(B)\otimes C_{f,0}) = (B_f\otimes C_f)\oplus(d_X(B)\otimes C_{f,0}). \tag{36}$$

Therefore $B_f = B_f \otimes 1 \subseteq A_f$ and $C_f = 1 \otimes C_f \subseteq A_f$. Thus $B = B_f \oplus d_X(B) \subseteq A_f + d_X(A)$ and $C = C_f \oplus d_X(C) \subseteq A_f + d_X(A)$. Since $A = B \otimes C$ is generated as an algebra by $B \otimes 1$ and $1 \otimes C$, we have $A \subseteq A_f + d_X(A)$ and so $A_f + d_X(A) = A$.

We are left to show that $A_f \cap d_X(A) = 0$. Let $\mathcal{B} := B \cap C(\Delta X)$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}_f := B_f \cap C(\Delta X)$, resp. $\mathcal{C} := C \cap C(\Delta X)$, resp. $\mathcal{C}_f := C_f \cap C(\Delta X)$) be the basis of monomials of B (resp. B_f, resp. C, resp. C_f). Then a nonzero element w of $A = B \otimes C$ is a sum

$$w = \sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i \otimes \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \alpha_{ij}v_{ij} = \sum_{i,j} \alpha_{ij}u_i \otimes v_{ij},$$

where $u_1 > \cdots > u_k \in \mathcal{B}, v_{i1} > \cdots > v_{in_i} \in \mathcal{C}, 0 \neq k_{ij} \in \mathbf{k}, 1 \leq j \leq n_i$. Then we have

$$d_X(w) = d_X\left(\sum_{i,j} k_{ij}u_i \otimes v_{ij}\right) = \sum_{i,j} \alpha_{ij}\left(d_X(u_i) \otimes v_{ij} + u_i \otimes d_X(v_{ij}) + \lambda d_X(u_i) \otimes d_X(v_{ij})\right). \tag{37}$$

We distinguish the following three cases.

Case 1. If $v_{11} \neq 1$, then the leading term in the sum in Eq. (37) is $u_1 \otimes \overline{d_X(v_{11})}$. Since $C_f \cap d_X(C) = 0$, we have $\overline{d_X(v_{11})} \notin \mathcal{C}_f$. Then $u_1 \otimes \overline{d_X(v_{11})} \notin \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{C}_f$. Since $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{C}_f$ is a basis of $B \otimes C_f$, we have $u_1 \otimes \overline{d_X(v_{11})} \notin B \otimes C_f$. Therefore $d_X(\sum_{ij} k_{ij}u_i \otimes v_{ij}) \notin B \otimes C_f$. By Eq. (36) we have

$$B \otimes C_f = B_f \otimes C_f \oplus d_X(B) \otimes C_f = B_f \otimes C_f \oplus d_X(B) \otimes C_{f,0} \oplus d_X(B) \otimes \mathbf{k} = A_f \oplus d_X(B) \otimes \mathbf{k}.$$

Therefore $d_X(w) \notin A_f$.

Case 2. If $v_{11} = 1$ and either $\overline{d_X(u_1)} > u_2$ or $\overline{d_X(u_1)} = u_2$ and $v_{21} = 1$, then since $d_X(1) = 0$, by the definition of the order defined on ΔX, the leading term in the sum in Eq. (37) is $\overline{d_X(u_1)} \otimes 1$ where $\overline{d_X(u_1)} \in \mathfrak{B}$ denotes the leading term of $d_X(u_1)$. Since $B_f \cap d_X(B) = 0$, we have $\overline{d_X(u_1)} \otimes 1 \notin \mathcal{B}_f$. Then $\overline{d_X(u_1)} \otimes 1 \notin \mathcal{B}_f \otimes \mathcal{C}$ and hence not in $B_f \otimes C$. Also $1 \notin \mathcal{C}_{f,0}$ implies that $\overline{d_X(u_1)} \otimes 1 \notin \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{C}_{f,0}$. Here $\mathcal{C}_{f,0} = \mathcal{C} \backslash \{1\}$ is the standard basis of $C_{f,0}$. Thus $\overline{d_X(u_1)} \otimes 1 \notin (\mathcal{B}_f \otimes \mathcal{C}) \cup (\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{C}_{f,0})$. Then we have $\overline{d_X(u_1)} \otimes 1 \notin (B_f \otimes C) + (B \otimes C_{f,0})$ and hence $d_X(\sum_{ij} k_{ij}u_i \otimes v_j) \notin (B_f \otimes C) + (B \otimes C_{f,0})$. Then $d_X(w)$ is not in A_f by Eq. (36).

Case 3. If $v_{11} = 1$, $\overline{d_X(u_1)} = u_2$ and $v_{21} \neq 1$ (note that $\overline{d_X(u_1)} < u_2$ is impossible since $u_1 > u_2$), then the leading term of the sum in Eq. (37) is $u_2 \otimes \overline{v_{21}}$. Then the proof is the same as for Case 1.

In summary, we have proved that $d_X(w) \notin A_f$ and hence $A_f \cap d_X(A) = 0$. ◻

Lemma 5.9. *Let $A_f = \mathbf{k}\{X\}_f$, $A_n = \mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X]$, $A_{n,f} = A_n \cap A_f$ and d_{A_n} to be the restriction $d|_{A_n}$ except $d(x^{(n)}) = 0$ for $x \in X$. Then $A_n = A_{n,f} \oplus d_{A_n}(A_n)$.*

Proof. Since $A_{n,f} \subset A_f$, $d_{A_n}(A_n) \subseteq d_X(A)$ and $A_f \cap d_X(A) = 0$ by Proposition 5.8, we have $A_{n,f} \cap \operatorname{im}(d_{A_n}) = 0$. Thus we only need to show $A_n \subseteq A_{n,f} + d_{A_n}(A_n)$ since $A_n \supseteq A_{n,f} + d_{A_n}(A_n)$ is clear. Suppose $A_n \nsubseteq A_{n,f} + d_{A_n}(A_n)$. There is a monomial $u \in C(\Delta_n X)$ in $A_n \backslash (A_{n,f} + d_{A_n}(A_n))$ that is minimal under the order $\leq_n$ on $C(\Delta_n X)$ defined in Eqs. (19) and (25). Then $u \notin A_f$. Assume the minimum variable in u is x and ℓ is the highest differential order of x in u. Then u can be expressed as $u = \hat{u}(x^{(\ell-1)})^m x^{(\ell)}$ with $\hat{u} \in C(\Delta X)$ and $m \geq 0$. Let $v = \hat{u}(x^{(\ell-1)})^{m+1} \in C(\Delta X)$. By Lemma 5.6, we have $u = \overline{d_{A_n}(v)}$. So we can write $u = d_{A_n}(v) - \sum_i c_i u_i$ with $0 \neq c_i \in \mathbf{k}$ and $u > u_i$. Then $d_{A_n}(v) \in d_{A_n}(A_n)$ and $u_i \in A_{n,f} + \operatorname{im}(d_{A_n})$ by the minimality of u in $A_n \backslash (A_{n,f} + \operatorname{im}(d_{A_n}))$. Thus $u \in A_{n,f} + \operatorname{im}(d_{A_n})$. This is a contradiction. ◻

Lemma 5.10. (a) *Let $\mathcal{A}_d := \{\overline{d_X(u)} \mid u \in C(\Delta X)\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_f := \{u \in C(\Delta X) \mid u$ is functional$\}$. Then $C(\Delta X)$ is the disjoint union of $\mathcal{A}_d$ and $\mathcal{A}_f$, that is, $C(\Delta X) = \mathcal{A}_d \sqcup \mathcal{A}_f$.*

(b) *We have $C(\Delta_n X) = (\mathcal{A}_d \cap C(\Delta_n X)) \sqcup (\mathcal{A}_f \cap C(\Delta_n X))$.*

Proof. (a) First we show that $\mathcal{A}_d \cap \mathcal{A}_f = \emptyset$. Let $\overline{d_X(u)} \in \mathcal{A}_d$ with $u \in C(\Delta X)$. Suppose the standard expression of u is $\hat{u}(x^{(\ell)})^m$ for some $\hat{u} \in C(\Delta X)$. Thus

$$\overline{d_X(u)} = \overline{\hat{u}d_X((x^{(\ell)})^m)} = \overline{\hat{u}(x^{(\ell)})^{m-1}x^{(\ell+1)}} = \bar{\hat{u}}(x^{(\ell)})^{m-1}x^{(\ell+1)}$$

and so $\overline{d_X(u)} \notin \mathcal{A}_f$. Next we show that $C(\Delta X) = \mathcal{A}_d \cup \mathcal{A}_f$. Let $u \in C(\Delta X) \setminus \mathcal{A}_f$. Suppose the minimum variable in u is x and ℓ is the largest differential degree of x. Then u can be expressed as $u = \hat{u}(x^{(\ell-1)})^m x^{(\ell)}$ with $\hat{u} \in C(\Delta X)$ and $m \geq 0$. Let $v = \hat{u}(x^{(\ell-1)})^{m+1} \in C(\Delta X)$. By Lemma 5.6, we have that $u = \overline{d_X(v)} \in \mathcal{A}_d$. Hence $C(\Delta X) = \mathcal{A}_d \sqcup \mathcal{A}_f$.

(b) Since $C(\Delta_n X) \subseteq C(\Delta X)$, the result holds from Item (a). □

Theorem 5.11. *Let $A_n, A_{n,f}$ be as defined in Lemma 5.9 and let $I_{ID,n}$ be the differential Rota-Baxter ideal of $\text{Ш}(A_n)$ generated by S_n in Eq. (28). Then as tensor product of modules*

$$\text{Ш}(A_n)/I_{ID,n} \cong A_n \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{k\geq 0} A_n \otimes A_{n,f}^{\otimes k} \otimes A_n \right).$$

Proof. For any $s = \phi(u,v) \in S_n$, by Lemma 5.2, we have $\overline{s} = 1 \otimes \overline{d(u_1)} \otimes w$, where $\overline{d(u_1)} \in \mathcal{A}_d \cap C(\Delta_n X)$ and $w \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)$. Recall that

$$\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X) = \sqcup_{m\geq 1} C(\Delta_n X)^{\otimes m} = \{a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_m \mid a_1, \cdots, a_m \in C(\Delta_n X), m \geq 1\}.$$

By Theorems 4.8 and 5.5, and Lemmas 5.9 and 5.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{S_n}) &= \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X) \setminus \{q|_{\overline{s}} \mid q \in \mathcal{B}^{\star}(\Delta_n X), s \in S_n, q|_s \text{ is normal}\} \\
&= \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X) \setminus \{q|_{1\otimes\overline{d(u_1)}\otimes w} \mid q \in \mathcal{B}^{\star}(\Delta_n X), \overline{d(u_1)} \in \mathcal{A}_d \cap C(\Delta_n X), w \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)\} \\
&= \mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X) \setminus \{a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_k \in C(\Delta_n X)^{\otimes k} \mid a_i \in \mathcal{A}_d \cap C(\Delta_n X) \text{ for some } 1 < i < k, k \geq 1\} \\
&= \{a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_k \mid a_1, a_k \in C(\Delta_n X), a_i \in \mathcal{A}_f \cap C(\Delta_n X) \text{ for } 1 < i < k, k \geq 1\}
\end{aligned}$$

is a $\mathbf{k}$-basis of $\mathbf{k}\mathcal{B}(\Delta_n X)/I_{ID}$. Since $A_n = \mathbf{k}C(\Delta_n X)$ and $A_{n,f} = \mathbf{k}\mathcal{A}_f \cap C(\Delta_n X)$, the theorem follows. □

Let

$$(38) \quad S := \left\{ P(d(u)P(v)) - uP(v) + P(uv) + \lambda P(d(u)v) \middle| u \in \text{Ш}(\Delta_n X) \setminus P(\text{Ш}(\Delta_n X)), v \in \text{Ш}(\Delta X) \right\}.$$

Lemma 5.12. *Let $I_{ID,n}$ (resp. I_{ID}) be the differential Rota-Baxter ideal of $\text{Ш}(\Delta_n X)$ (resp. $\text{Ш}(\Delta X)$) generated by S_n (resp. S). Then as $\mathbf{k}$-modules we have $I_{ID,1} \subseteq I_{ID,2} \subseteq \cdots$, $I_{ID} = \cup_{n\geq 1} I_{ID,n}$ and $I_{ID,n} = I_{ID} \cap \mathbf{k}\text{Ш}(\Delta_n X)$.*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{k}\text{Ш}(\Delta_n X) \subseteq \mathbf{k}\text{Ш}(\Delta_{n+1} X)$ for any $n \geq 1$, we have $I_{ID,1} \subseteq I_{ID,2} \subseteq \cdots$ and $I_{ID} = \cup_{n\geq 1} I_{ID,n}$ by Eq. (28). We next show $I_{ID,n} = I_{ID} \cap \text{Ш}(\Delta_n X)$. Obviously, $I_{ID,n} \subseteq I_{ID} \cap \text{Ш}(\Delta_n X)$. So we only need to verify $I_{ID} \cap \text{Ш}(\Delta_n X) \subseteq I_{ID,n}$. By Theorem 5.11 we have

$$\text{Ш}(\Delta_n X) \cong \left(A_n \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{k\geq 0} A_n \otimes A_{n,f}^{\otimes k} \otimes A_n \right) \right) \oplus I_{ID,n}.$$

Let

$$J_n := A_n \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{k\geq 0} A_n \otimes A_{n,f}^{\otimes k} \otimes A_n \right).$$

Then $\text{Ш}(\Delta_n X) = J_n \oplus I_{ID,n}$ and $J_1 \subseteq J_2 \subseteq \cdots$. Let $n, k \geq 1$. Since $J_{n+k} \cap I_{ID,n+k} = 0$ and $J_n \subseteq J_{n+k}$, we have $J_n \cap I_{ID,n+k} = 0$. Since $I_{ID,n} \subseteq I_{ID,n+k}$, by modular law we have

$$(39) \qquad I_{ID,n+k} \cap \text{Ш}(\Delta_n X) = I_{ID,n+k} \cap (J_n \oplus I_{ID,n}) = (I_{ID,n+k} \cap J_n) \oplus I_{ID,n} = I_{ID,n}.$$

Let $u \in I_{ID} \cap \text{Ш}(\Delta_n X)$. By $I_{ID} = \cup_{n\geq 1} I_{ID,n}$, we have $u \in I_{ID,N}$ for some $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. If $N \geq n$, by Eq. (39), $u \in I_{ID,N} \cap \text{Ш}(\Delta_n X) = I_{ID,n}$. If $N < n$, then $u \in I_{ID,N} \subseteq I_{ID,n}$. Hence $I_{ID} \cap \text{Ш}(\Delta_n X) \subseteq I_{ID,n}$ and so $I_{ID} \cap \text{Ш}(\Delta_n X) = I_{ID,n}$. □

Now we are ready to prove the main result of this paper.

Theorem 5.13. (=*Theorem 1.1*) *Let X be a nonempty well-ordered set. Let $\text{Ш}(\mathbf{k}\{X\}) = \text{Ш}(\Delta X)$ be the free commutative differential Rota-Baxter algebra on X. Let I_{ID} be the ideal of $\text{Ш}(\mathbf{k}\{X\})$ generated by S defined in Eq. (38). Then the composition*

$$\text{Ш}(A)_f := A \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{k\geq 0} A \otimes A_f^{\otimes k} \otimes A \right) \hookrightarrow \text{Ш}(A) \to \text{Ш}(A)/I_{ID}$$

of the inclusion and the quotient map is a linear isomorphism. In other words,

$$\text{Ш}(A) = \text{Ш}(A)_f \oplus I_{ID}.$$

Proof. First assume that X is finite. Denote $A = \mathbf{k}[\Delta X]$ and $A_n = \mathbf{k}[\Delta_n X], n \geq 1$. By Theorem 5.11 and Lemma 5.12 we have the linear isomorphisms

$$A_n \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{k\geq 0} A_n \otimes A_{n,f}^{\otimes k} \otimes A_n \right) \cong \text{Ш}(\Delta_n X)/I_{ID,n} = \text{Ш}(\Delta_n X)/(I_{ID} \cap \text{Ш}(\Delta_n X)) \cong (\text{Ш}(\Delta_n X) + I_{ID})/I_{ID}$$

that are compatible with the direct system $\varinjlim A_n$. Since $A = \varinjlim A_n$ as $\mathbf{k}$-module, we have

$$A \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{k\geq 0} A \otimes A_f^{\otimes k} \otimes A \right) = \varinjlim \left(A_n \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{k\geq 0} A_n \otimes A_{n,f}^{\otimes k} \otimes A_n \right) \right) \cong \varinjlim ((\text{Ш}(\Delta_n X) + I_{ID})/I_{ID}) = \text{Ш}(A)/I_{ID}.$$

Now let X be a nonempty well-ordered set. Let Y be a finite subset of X. Denote $A_{X,f} = A_f, A_{Y,f} = \mathbf{k}\{Y\}_f$. Then by the definition of A_f we have

$$A_Y \cap A_{X,f} = A_{Y,f} \quad \text{and} \quad d_X(A_Y) = d_Y(A_Y). \tag{40}$$

Let $a \in A_X$. Then there is a finite $Y \subseteq X$ such that $a \in A_Y$. Thus by Proposition 5.8, we have $a \in A_{Y,f} + d_X(A_Y)$ which is contained in $A_{X,f} + d_X(A_X)$ by Eq. (40). Thus $A_X = A_{X,f} + d_X(A_X)$. On the other hand, let $0 \neq a \in d_X(A_X)$. Then $a = d_X(b)$ for $b \in A_X$. Then there is a finite $Y \subseteq X$ such that $b \in A_Y$ and hence $a \in d_Y(A_Y)$. Then by Proposition 5.8 and Eq. (40), we have $a \notin A_{Y,f} = A_Y \cap A_{X,f}$. Hence $a \notin A_{X,f}$. This proves $A_{X,f} \cap d_X(A_X) = 0$. Hence $A_X = A_{X,f} \oplus d_X(A_X)$.

Now let $u \in \text{Ш}(A_X)$. Then there is a finite subset $Y \subseteq X$ such that $a \in \text{Ш}(A_Y)$. Then by the case of finite sets proved above, $u \in \text{Ш}(A_Y)_f + I_{Y,ID}$. By definition, $\text{Ш}(A_Y)_f \subseteq \text{Ш}(A)_f$ and $I_{Y,ID} \subseteq I_{ID}$. Hence $u \in \text{Ш}(A)_f + I_{ID}$. Further, if $0 \neq u \in I_{ID}$, then there is a finite $Y \subseteq X$ such that $u \in I_{Y,ID}$. Thus u is not in $\text{Ш}(A_Y)_f$ since $\text{Ш}(A_Y)_f \cap I_{Y,ID} = 0$. By the definition of $\text{Ш}(A_X)_f$, we have $\text{Ш}(A_Y) \cap \text{Ш}(A_X)_f = \text{Ш}(A_Y)_f$. Therefore u is not in $\text{Ш}(A_X)_f$. This proves $\text{Ш}(A_X) = \text{Ш}(A_X)_f \oplus I_{X,ID}$. ◻

Acknowledgements: Xing Gao thanks support from NSFC grant 11201201. Li Guo acknowledges support from NSF grant DMS 1001855.

References

[1] F. Baader T. and Nipkow, Term Rewriting and All That, Cambridge U. P., Cambridge, 1998. 8, 9, 11

[2] C. Bai, A unified algebraic approach to classical Yang-Baxter equation, *J. Phys. A* **40** (2007), 11073-11082. 2

[3] G. Baxter, An analytic problem whose solution follows from a simple algebraic identity, *Pacific J. Math.* **10** (1960), 731–742. 2

[4] G. M. Bergman, The diamond lemma for ring theory, *Adv. Math.* **29** (1978), 178-218. 3

[5] L. A. Bokut, Imbeddings into simple associative algebras, *Algebra i Logika* **15** (1976), 117-142. 3

[6] L. A. Bokut, Y. Chen, Y. Chen, Composition-Diamond lemma for tensor product of free algebras, *J. Algebra* **323** (2010), 2520-2537. 3

[7] L. A. Bokut, Y. Chen and X. Deng, Gröbner-Shirshov bases for Rota-Baxter algebras, *Siberian Math. J.* **51** (2010), 978-988. 3

[8] L. A. Bokut, Y. Chen and Y. Li, Gröbner-Shirshov bases for categories, in "Operads and Universal Algebra", World Scientific Press, (2012) 1-23. 3

[9] L. A. Bokut, Y. Chen and J. Qiu, Greobner-Shirshov bases for associative algebras with multiple operators and free Rota-Baxter algebras, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **214** (2010) 89-110. 3, 6

[10] L.A. Bokut, V. Latyshev, I. Shestakov, E. Zelmanov (Eds.), Selected Works of A.I. Shirshov, Birkh*ä*ser, Basel, Boston, Berlin, 2009, vii, 241 pp. transl. M. Bremner, M. Kotchetov. 3

[11] B. Buchberger, An algorithm for finding a basis for the residue class ring of a zero-dimensional polynomial ideal [in German], Ph.D. thesis, University of Innsbruck, Austria, (1965). 3

[12] P. Cartier, On the structure of free Baxter algebras, *Adv. Math.* **9** (1972), 253-265. 2

[13] P. Cassidy, L.Guo, W. Keigher, W. Sit (Eds.), Differential Algebra and Related Topics (Proceedings for the International Workshop in Newark, NJ, 2000), World Sci. Publishing, 2002. 1

[14] P. M. Cohn, Algebra, Vol. 3, 2nd ed., J. Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1991. 8

[15] K. Ebrahimi-Fard and L. Guo, Mixable shuffles, quasi-shuffles and Hopf algebras, *J. Algebraic Combinatorics*, **24** (2006), 83–101, arXiv:math.RA/0506418. 5

[16] K. Ebrahimi-Fard, L. Guo and D. Kreimer, Spitzer's identity and the algebraic Birkhoff decomposition in pQFT, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **37** (2004), 11037-11052. 2

[17] L. Guo, Operated semigroups, Motzkin paths and rooted trees, *J. Algebraic Combin.* **29** (2009), 35-62. 6, 7

[18] L. Guo, WHAT IS a Rota-Baxter algebra, *Notice of Amer. Math. Soc.* **56** (2009) 1436-1437. 2

[19] L. Guo, Introduction to Rota-Baxter Algebra, Higher Education Press and International Press, 2012. 2, 5, 6, 7

[20] L. Guo and W. Keigher, Baxter algebras and shuffle products, *Adv. Math.*, **150** (2000), 117–149, arXiv:math/0407155. 2, 5, 6

[21] L. Guo and W. Keigher, On free Baxter algebras: completions and the internal construction, *Adv. Math.* **151** (2000), 101–127, arXiv:math/0407156. 5, 6

[22] L. Guo and W. Keigher, On differential Rota-Baxter algebras, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **212** (2008), 522-540. 2, 3, 5, 6

[23] L. Guo, G. Regensburger and M. Rosenkranz, On integro-differential algebras, arXiv:1212.0266. 2, 3, 4, 24

[24] L. Guo, W. Sit and R. Zhang, Differemtail type operators and Gröbner-Shirshov bases, *J. Symolic Comput.* (2012). 6

[25] L. Guo and B. Zhang, Renormalization of multiple zeta values, *J. Algebra*, **319** (2008), 3770–3809. 2, 5

[26] H. Hironaka, Resolution of singulatities of an algebraic variety over a field if characteristic zero, I, *Ann. Math.* **79** (1964), 109-203. 3

[27] M. Hoffman, Quasi-shuffle products, *J. Algebraic Combin.*, **11** (2000), 49–68. 2, 5

[28] E. R. Kolchin, Differential Algebras and Algebraic Groups, Academic Press, New York, 1973. 1

[29] J. Qiu, Gröbner-Shirshov bases for commutative algebras with multiple operators and free commutative Rota-Baxter algebras, *Asian-European Jour. Math.*, to appear. 6

[30] J.F. Ritt, Differential Equations from the Algebraic Standpoint, Amer. Math. Sco. Colloq. Pub. **14**, Amer. Math. Soc., New York (1934). 1

[31] J.F. Ritt, Differential Algebra, Amer. Math. Sco. Colloq. Pub. **33**, Amer. Math. Soc., New York (1950). 1

[32] M. Rosenkranz and G. Regensburger, Solving and factoring boundary problems for linear ordinary differential equations in differential algebra, *J. Symbolic Comput.* **43** (2008), 515–544. 2

[33] G.-C. Rota, Baxter algebras and combinatorial identities I, II, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **75** (1969), 325–329, 330–334. 2

[34] G.-C. Rota, Baxter operators, an introduction, In: "Gian-Carlo Rota on Combinatorics, Introductory papers and commentaries", Joseph P. S. Kung, Editor, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1995. 2

[35] M. A. Semenov-Tian-Shansky, What is a classical r-matrix?, *Funct. Ana. Appl.*, **17** (1983) 259-272. 2

[36] A. I. Shirshov, Some algorithmic problem for Å-algebras, Sibirsk. Mat. Z., 3(1962), 132-137. 3

[37] M. Singer and M. van der Put, Galois Theory of Linear Differential Equations, Springer, 2003. 1

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LANZHOU UNIVERSITY, LANZHOU, GANSU 730000, CHINA
E-mail address: `gaoxing@lzu.edu.cn`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, NEWARK, NJ 07102, USA
E-mail address: `liguo@rutgers.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LANZHOU UNIVERSITY, LANZHOU, GANSU 730000, CHINA
E-mail address: `zheng2712801@163.com`